

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15783. A bill for the relief of Harry Stanley Spaulding, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 15784. A bill for the relief of J. F.

Nighswander; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 15785. A bill to transfer the right of the United States to phosphates in certain real property owned by Charles N. Bardin, Jr., James H. Hickman, Leroy Miller, and Oscar T. Hubbard of Tampa, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 15786. A bill to authorize the Presi-

dent of the United States to present in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to Brig. Gen. Charles E. Yeager; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUDNUT:

H.R. 15787. A bill for the relief of Valerie Ann Chambers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 15788. A bill for the relief of Mitsue Karimata Stone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DICTATING PRODUCT SAFETY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1974

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, recently an article on the Consumer Product Safety Commission appeared in the May 18 issue of *Business Week* magazine. The article was entitled "Dictating Product Safety," and I present the article in a condensed form for the information of my colleagues:

DICTATING PRODUCT SAFETY

Richard O. Simpson, 44-year-old chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, likes to compare his job to hunting tigers. "You go in with drums and bugles," he says, "and you beat the drums and blow the bugles to let the tigers know you're coming. Then if you catch any, all you've got are the dumb tigers who didn't believe you, the deaf tigers who didn't hear you, or the fighting tigers who didn't care and will fight anybody. The other tigers are smart and take warning which is why we are beating the drums to begin with."

This week—on the first anniversary of his swearing-in—Simpson took his tiger hunt to the Holiday Inn in Bethesda, Md., where he chaired the first National Conference on Product Safety. For three days, delegates appointed by the governors of all 50 states discussed ways to minimize conflicts between state and federal product safety laws and how to coordinate enforcement of the Consumer Product Safety Act, which created Simpson's commission. Also at the conference—strictly as spectators—were scores of businessmen, consumerists, lobbyists, lawyers, journalists, and plain, interested citizens.

The conference capped a busy first year for what is rapidly becoming one of the government's most powerful and pervasive regulatory agencies. With a life-and-death say over more than 11,000 consumer products, the five-member commission and its staff of 750 technicians, lawyers, and administrative help have poked into everything from aerosol spray cans to television sets, bicycles, lamps, ranges and ovens, mowers and garden tractors, carbonated beverage bottles, and aluminum home wiring.

This has thrown the little known, but already controversial, agency up against some of the largest companies in American industry: General Electric, Sears, Montgomery Ward, RCA, Philco-Ford, Zenith, Admiral, Borden, 3M—to name only a few. Many of these companies had intensive safety programs long before Congress created the CPSC. But now as a marketing executive at Westinghouse Electric Corp. puts it: "We have certainly increased our awareness of product safety and formalized our procedures." Adds John A. Marchese, vice-president for merchandise procurement at Mont-

gomery Ward & Co.: "I'm not sure we move more quickly now [on defective products]. But we are more deliberate because of the consequences. Now we have to notify the government and put out press releases. Before, bang—we moved like that."

TARGET FOR ATTACK

The result can be a hefty boost in administrative and technical expenses, which carries major implications at a time when other costs are also soaring. Last August, for instance, Sears, Roebuck & Co. ran into trouble with one of its electric power mowers. On some machines, a slight electrical impulse from the motor neutralized a safety device that was supposed to keep the motor from starting while the machine was in gear. Of 33,000 mowers, only 10,000 were affected. Yet to determine which mowers were faulty, Sears personnel had to go out with dental mirrors and read the names on each safety device of each mower.

The concern at Certain-Teed Products Corp. is even more basic: There are already far too many regulatory agencies, the company feels, so why another? As a Certain-Teed executive notes, the CPSC can influence or overrule other agencies. "This means that if you're in compliance according to one agency, you may not be in compliance with the CPSC," he says. "It's our view that the creation of a superagency or any agency to oversee other agencies will be difficult to deal with."

Along the way, Simpson has trampled some political toes, as well. Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D-N.C.) is trying to restrict the commission's mandate. Senator John G. Tower (R-Tex.) has called for a probe of the commission's performance. Representative Earl F. Landgrebe (R-Ind.) has introduced a bill to abolish the commission. Even the White House, which originally nominated Simpson and his four fellow commissioners, admits to a later attempt to dump the energetic, outspoken chairman.

Depending upon the critic and his particular gripe, Simpson has been attacked as brash, arbitrary, radical, stubborn, and "deliberately provocative." In some ways, he may be all of these. With what he calls a "goldfish bowl" strategy of "doing the public's business in public," Simpson plays to the press and has shown a flamboyant knack for grabbing headlines—sometimes with a zeal that has injured innocent companies. . . .

NONCOMPLIANCE WITH A COMMISSION RULING CAN BRING FINES OF UP TO \$500,000

Simpson notes that most other government regulators have the same authority to impose criminal penalties. "But they are reluctant to use them," he claims. "In my view, that is amending the law." Then with a sharp edge in his voice, he adds: "Look, nobody asked me if I thought the Product Safety Act should have criminal penalty provisions in it. But as administrator, I have the obligation to enforce the law, even if that means asking for criminal penalties. Not to use the power we have, where appropriate, would be amending the law, and only Congress has the right to do that."

Michael A. Brown, commission general counsel, cites recent run-ins with National Presto Industries, Inc., (electric frypans) and McCulloch Corp. (chain saws). The CPSC came down on products made by both companies, but neither manufacturer responded. "We just got tired of waiting around for them to move," he says, "so we told them to tell it to the judge." Before administrative proceedings could begin, however, both companies offered to settle. At least one major retail chain is even preparing for the ultimate contingency. It recently designated a key senior vice-president as "the one who goes to jail" if the company runs afoul of the CPSC. The executive immediately called his staff into the office and announced flatly: "There shall be no screwups."

"ONE OF OUR BIGGEST PROBLEMS IS INDUSTRY UNWILLINGNESS TO CHALLENGE US"

After its first full year of operation, the commission has run into only a few companies that dig in their heels at an agency ruling. One is Wel-Dex Mfg. Co., a small Houston subsidiary of Relco, Inc., which does a \$6-million-a-year business in electrical equipment. On Feb. 22 the commission put out a press release on Wel-Dex home arc welders, warning that "terminals on the welders are exposed, posing a potential fatal shock hazard, and poor connections on the cords could render the entire frame electrically alive."

Thomas H. Doss, founder and president of Wel-Dex, disputes the commission findings and claims that he was "coerced into signing a statement to halt production of the welder." The commission attorneys, he adds "threatened to make me recall every single welder that had been sold. They threatened civil action of \$500,000 in fines, and they also threatened criminal action. I was scared to death. I'm just a small businessman. I can't refund \$5-million." Last month Doss filed suit against the commission, charging that its original press release was "in violation of due process." He also contends that an effort by commission agents to inspect his plant constituted "duress, coercion, harassment, and intimidation."

Such cases, however, are rare. Far more often, companies simply comply. A few weeks ago, for instance, the commission ordered a San Francisco-based chain of import shops to remove \$200 to \$300 worth of paperweights from its shelves; the paperweights were designed to look like light bulbs, and the commission worried about consumers trying to screw them into a socket. "We didn't question the commission order," says Marvin Fisher, a vice-president of Cost Plus, Inc. If the product had been worth more money, adds a Cost Plus attorney, "we would have asked the commission to come forth with more evidence and give us a hearing. Because of the nature of the product and the small amount of money involved, it wasn't worth the trouble to argue the point."

Surprisingly, Simpson prefers the more combative reaction over the quick compliance of Cost Plus. "One of our biggest problems is industry unwillingness to challenge

us," Simpson complains. "The necessary checks and balances must come from industry, as well as from Congress. And when industry capitulates and then bad-mouths us, it just makes for a bad precedent. Sometimes, too, I think companies have reported a hazard without first sitting down and deciding if it really is a substantial product hazard. 'Frankly,' Simpson stresses, 'I'd be more satisfied if industry would stand up for its rights.'"

A COMMUNICATION PROBLEM

There is one grievance that does prompt companies to stand up to the commission—and often vehemently. That is the commission's "goldfish bowl" approach to regulation. They claim there is too much contact with the press and too much "shooting from the hip" before the commission has all the facts.

"I don't think the commission realizes the position that it holds in the eyes of the general public and the media," says George Grippo, consumer marketing manager for Loctite Corp., which produces anaerobic and cyanoacrylate adhesives. "When the commission releases a statement, it should make [the charges] clear to the press, so that the statement cannot be misinterpreted, making the manufacturer suffer from it."

Loctite speaks as a company that suffered. Last January, as the Newington (Conn.) manufacturer launched its first big foray into the consumer market, the commission put out a press release, announcing an "investigation" of these so-called "superglues." Not until a few days later did Loctite, which accounts for 40% of the superglue business, receive official notification.

The commission wanted only a stronger label warning to protect consumers against eye injury. While Loctite and other manufacturers quickly obliged, press reports mistakenly suggested that a ban might be imminent. "It was a communication problem, and it still hasn't been straightened out," says Grippo. "We lost a lot of sales. Sears doesn't want to come close to the product. They don't even want to talk about it. And before, they had interest." Loctite had been projecting \$500,000 to \$600,000 in consumer sales the first year. "Because of all this," Grippo notes, "we're doing considerably less."

The commission ran into an even stickler problem with another glue: aerosol spray adhesives. Last August the agency banned 13 spray adhesives—only to reverse itself in February. Further scientific studies, the commission said in lifting the ban, failed to confirm original findings that the sprays contributed to birth defects. Yet the commission stopped short of declaring the adhesives safe—they were simply "not unsafe," as Simpson puts it.

This is scant consolation for 3M Co., one of two major manufacturers of the glue. "We don't feel the books have really been balanced in this incident," says a 3M spokesman. Nor does Senator Tower. He attacked the commission handling of the sprays as "part of a pattern" that included "arbitrary and capricious disregard for due process and equitable administration" of the law.

Some of the sharpest criticism of Simpson and his running of the commission centers on a tendency to look beyond his immediate mandate and start poking into other product areas. Several months ago he shook up gun lobbyists when he said, only half-jokingly, that firearms were indeed outside of the agency's jurisdiction—but not ammunition. Senator Ervin was no more amused when Simpson announced that the commission was considering a ban on all cigarettes above a certain tar level. While tobacco products are not included under the Consumer Product Safety Act, Simpson claims that they do fall under the Hazardous Substances Act, which comes under his jurisdiction. With an eye on his tobacco-growing

constituency in North Carolina, an angry Ervin fired off a note to Simpson, disputing his legal interpretation, and asked the General Accounting Office for an opinion. The GAO came down squarely on Ervin's side. Simpson, however, claims that the legal question is still open.

OFF-BOUNDS TO CRITICS

The criticism does not bother Simpson. On the one hand, his agency enjoys wide support among most of the companies that it regulates. At the same time, Simpson's commission is beyond the reach of most of its critics. Congress wrote strong provisions into the Consumer Product Safety Act, guaranteeing the commission's independence from both political and business pressures. This includes a key clause that makes the agency accountable to Congress, rather than to the President. The Commission's budget and legislative recommendations go directly to Congress without the customary imprimatur of the Administration's Office of Management & Budget. Simpson interprets this part of the law so broadly that Congress is privy to nearly all budget communications between the commission and the OMB. Unaccustomed to such Congressional scrutiny, the OMB has objected strenuously, if only privately. Characteristically, Simpson ignores it.

Simpson has even balked at the idea of routine White House "political clearance" for top commission staffers. "Political clearance means political control or interference," he says. This has held up official White House approval of some key Simpson appointments. (During the standoff, they are paid as "consultants.") While the White House and other critics would like to dislodge Simpson, he seems safe at least until his term runs out next year. Under the law, the chairman serves a fixed term—not at the pleasure of the President.

So Simpson is inclined to let the controversy swirl over his head as he pursues what he considers to be his agency's main mission: getting the word out to the public on unsafe products. So far, Simpson admits that the commission has only made a small beginning. A spokesman for Gump's, the San Francisco merchant, says he "never heard of it"—referring to the commission. Another San Francisco retailer, Baruch Petranker Import Co., learned about the commission the hard way. Recently, says a Petranker executive, "a nice lady came in and said the hair dryers we import might be bad." She took several for testing. Two weeks later the CPSC told the company to stop selling them.

The challenge, says Simpson, is creating "public awareness and understanding of who we are and what we do. The Consumer Product Safety Commission is hardly a household word." At least, not yet.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS DESCHLER

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1974

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, since our inception as a dream in the hearts of a few brave men to the foremost democratic nation on Earth, the United States has been privileged with more high caliber public servants than probably any other country in history. The House, as a melting pot of American aspirations, has shared in this fortune in having the able services of a long line of distinguished citizens and Members. In the forefront of these men must stand Lewis Deschler.

The House Parliamentarian since 1928, Lewis Deschler has served nine Speakers, and in doing so, he, following the great example of Thomas Jefferson, has established a body of parliamentary procedure and experience equaled by none.

For 10 of his 46 years of service I have served in this body and have found Lew to have been most courteous and helpful to the attentions and needs of not only the leadership, but of the individual Members themselves. His advice has always served as an accurate and knowledgeable assessment of the situation at hand, and his friendship has been appreciated by all.

Lew is retiring now, but in my mind's eye he will always rank as one of the country's foremost citizens, a man who has given much to this country and particularly to the House which he has served so ably over the last five decades. I want to wish him and his family the best in coming years, and I also look forward to continue receiving the benefits of his experience and advice, in his position as a special counsel to the Office of the Parliamentarian.

A NATIONAL NUTRITIONAL POLICY

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished and concerned constituent of mine, Mr. D. Dean Rhodes, of Fort Wayne, Ind., recently testified before the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. He is a member of the Committee on Nutrition and Food Availability. His remarks and recommendations as then pertain to a national nutrition policy, are timely:

IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF OUR LARGE SCALE MEAL DELIVERY SYSTEMS

While our institutions such as schools, hospitals, nursing homes, military establishments, prisons, etc. now maintain a high professional nutritional standard, and their efficiencies provide meals at a lower cost than in the home, they still have a need to make them even more efficient and to benefit more individuals.

If we rate the food preparation and service efficiency in an institution on the basis of total hours worked by all food service workers, including supervision and management, and divide this sum into the total of meals produced and consumed, we come up with the number of meals produced per worker hour.

Due to a number of factors, but due mainly to the more recent developments of new systems of equipment, institutions can now produce more meals per worker hour. These efficiencies are significant, and in some situations improvements of up to 500% are possible.

Thus as the trend for institutions to become the very foundation for universal feeding, it is essential that these institutions are equipped with the latest most efficient food production and service systems.

This improved efficiency has the same effect as producing a bushel of corn with a cost of one minute of labor, instead of our old production rate of ten minutes per bushel.

New large scale meal preparation and delivery systems of two minutes of labor per meal contrast with older systems of ten minutes of labor per meal.

The upgrading to large scale meal delivery systems would contribute not only to a more efficient use of labor, but to improved nutrition, and reduction in waste of food, at the same time upgrading the presentation of the food from a temperature and appearance standpoint.

Of the 52 million children enrolled in schools throughout the United States, we are presently serving lunch to 20 million plus children each day. If we can assume that 10% are absent on any given day, that leaves us with 26 million unfed children.

The present annual cost of school lunch is over 2.2 billions of dollars. Half of this money comes from children who pay for their lunches, approximately one-fourth is funded from State Government subsidy, and one-fourth from the Federal Government (about one-half of the Federal Government's contribution is in the form of food commodities).

Our immediate concern is for 26 million children who are not receiving a lunch are the ones who need it most.

Universal School Lunch, in its purist form, means simply that all 46 million children would receive their meals free, even those who can afford to pay.

I think that this nation has an enormous opportunity to feed all the children of America a meal during the noon hour in which they are at school. The opportunity to make a commitment once and for all to the many school districts, both large and small, to begin at once to accomplish the goals of Universal School Food Service programs.

As a manufacturer of food service equipment, we have had the opportunity and challenge to watch and be a part of the growing School Lunch Program over the past 18 years.

Today I will relate from our own statistics. These may vary from those of other groups, and, of course, are subject to a host of variables, but the absolute exactness of each statistic is not important. The formula of how we arrived at these statistics is very vital here today.

The question is not the desirability of a Universal School Lunch Program in America because the need is there. The ultimate question is . . . the cost and the timing.

It is my opinion that the plan that we outline today, if interpreted into legislation, could bring a Universal School Lunch Program to America quickly and with a realistic price tag.

Unfortunately, I cannot convey this plan with a broad brush, for it is only through understanding the formulas and their details that you will be able to evaluate the system we propose.

What we are presenting is being utilized in over 200 school districts and can be verified. Therefore, the formula can be tested and proven.

The greatest promise to make Universal School Lunch a reality is found in the technology that industry has developed most recently.

In school lunch, we rate food service productivity by number of meals per worker hour. The result is that present school food service productivity would be about the same as our comparing propeller driven aircraft to our highest speed jets. School food service productivity is rated low due to its lack of widespread utilization of current technology, and I think changing this productivity will permit us to have Universal School Food Service at a low cost.

The school lunch industry produces eight (8) meals per worker hour. This speed of eight meals per worker hour is a national average and some schools may produce as little as two meals per worker hour, and there are many that produce more.

Prior to 1956, nearly all schools in the school lunch program had unit kitchens or in simple terms, one kitchen for every school building. The new technology and system that enabled the school lunch industry to improve productivity of meals per worker hour was the result of development of the bulk food transporting system. This Central Kitchen System enables a school district to utilize its largest kitchen . . . bringing its best people expertise into a central location to prepare the food and then transport the food to all of its schools, referred to as Satellite Schools.

But this system has not succeeded as well as it should because it requires a large first-time capital expenditure for the central kitchen and equipment, an expenditure that the schools cannot fund on a one-time basis. This is basically because the school's budget on a school-by-school basis rather than an overall school district basis. If schools could have provided the capital over the past eighteen years, school lunch labor could be producing about 300% more meals for the same amount of labor dollars. This would have given us a very significant increase in productivity and would have helped to eliminate many of the problems we are facing today.

This is why I am recommending that in future legislation, we begin to equip our schools to utilize the new technology . . . the new systems . . . so that we do not repeat that same mistake again.

Our solution to solve the problems of malnutrition in the age group of children in our school systems is simple, effective, low cost, and can be utilized in any school. It takes advantage of all the new and modern technology that has been provided by our American industry. Food served through this system can meet all the Type A meal requirements established by the United States Department of Agriculture, and can be varied enough to provide in addition to luncheon menus, breakfasts, nutrition breaks, and even dinner.

Food quality is better due to our employing the best cooks in one location. Because of the transport equipment used, the meals are protected for nutritional quality.

The system can utilize canned foods or frozen factory pack, or any other form of convenience foods, or fully prepared kitchen foods. It satisfies the need to vary and market food in such a way that the children will enjoy the food and participate in the school lunch program.

At lunchtime, a part-time worker working two to three hours a day receives the food at the Satellite School, wheels it into a serving counter, and serves as many as 300 meals in less than 30 minutes. Children are served a nutritious hot lunch along with cold salads, milk, and desserts. This system can produce up to three to five times more meals per worker hour. Workers benefit from reduced kitchen drudgery, and can utilize their talents for improving nutrition education.

This system is handicapped by the original capital investment, even though the labor savings may pay for itself in less than one year. Nevertheless, it is difficult for the school districts that need it most to afford the initial costs.

Let's bear in mind that in America we have always utilized the most practical, economical, and efficient systems available, and the true benefits may be the additional dollars it allows to buy more nutrition education and better quality foods.

The reason for sharing these new industry technologies with you is two-fold:

1. We want to assure you that the Food Service Equipment industry is capable of supplying the systems and expertise necessary to support a Universal School Lunch Program, but more importantly, to convey that this new technology can actually reduce costs sufficiently to make a Universal School

Lunch Program feasible much sooner than might otherwise be possible.

We are presently spending Government funds of over \$300 million in this program, commodities are valued at \$265 million, and the States' contribution of \$547 million. This brings our costs or our contribution cost of both state and federal governments up to \$1.112 billion.

The children's parents are paying another \$1.104 billion for lunch. If we adopt the Universal School Lunch Program using the present food preparation methods, which we consider antique, the cost is going to be much higher and the cost for adding the 26.8 million children to the program will add another \$2.560 billion.

If you are going to think in terms of what additional monies it would cost us to go into the Universal School Lunch Program using present methods, we would, first of all, add to what we are spending, the parent's \$1.104 billion plus the \$2.560 billion, and this brings the total price tag up to \$4.776 billion on an annualized basis for the Universal School Lunch Program.

Any amount of money will not solve the problem without first of all solving the basic problem of the proper tools to work with. Where will we find the equipment for many of the schools in this program to feed the 26.8 million children?

Most of these schools do not have any equipment at all. Some will have to upgrade present equipment, some will need additional equipment to accommodate the added load of the number of meals to be produced.

The equipment price tag, using the outmoded unit or single kitchen concept, would add on a one-time basis another \$3.350 billion. We have to consider that the first time cost of a Universal School Lunch Program that first year, if in fact it could be done in one year, would be \$8.126 billion.

However, the system that we propose, the "Large Scale Meal Delivery System", (the numbers here are the same as far as the input; the \$1.112 billion of Federal cash; Federal commodities, and State aid still would be the same) can provide food service for 46.8 million children that are now in the program, at an additional \$2.309 billion cost.

By using this system, we can save on an annualized basis \$1.355 billion dollars. In order to achieve this savings, we must do a proper job of equipping for Large Scale Meal Delivery Systems, and that cost again is a one-time cost of \$936 million contrasted to doing it the other way and spending \$3.350 billion, which is the unit kitchen concept, or \$2.414 billion saved. But once that money is invested, we can save the \$1.355 billion each year thereafter.

Now, as a businessman, I tried to determine what's the lowest cost method to approach this program and to provide the Universal School Lunch Program at a price that would not be frightening to the Congress, and this is the lowest cost method that we can determine. If we would equip all the schools with the Large Scale Meal Delivery System at a one-time cost of \$936 million, then the amount that we would need to spend thereafter over our present \$1.112 billion, our added cost over those figures, once we had this equipment, would only be \$2.309 billion per year.

When we compare these costs with the testimony of all of the prior cost estimates of this program, this is a substantial savings . . . which, I believe, could lead us into a Universal School Lunch Program much more rapidly and at a feasible price tag.

Let's look at it another way. We said that in 1956 we made a mistake by not starting to utilize Large Scale Meal Delivery Systems. We have also made some mistakes very recently even since the White House Conference. Some of the programs that have come on stream recently have been crash programs, and as a result, we have not taken

into account proper food preparation equipment and the resulting productivity in many cases is still at 1946 per worker hour levels.

In these crash programs we have not always taken into consideration the proper sanitation, cleanliness, and protection of the food from a nutrition standpoint and quality. We need to upgrade these programs. However, if we don't set a correct course for the future, if we go into a Universal School Lunch Program . . . heaven forbid, and make the same mistakes we have made in the past . . . over the next 20 years either the Federal or State Government will spend \$30,869 billion more at present prices than would need to be spent. That is why it is vital we do not repeat these same mistakes again.

Let's see how we can accomplish this tremendous task. How do we feed 46.8 million children without adding any labor cost? The facts are . . . that by using Large Scale Meal Delivery Systems to serve every child presently in schools in the United States, we will need an equivalent of 195,000 full-time workers. Today schools employ some 312,500 school lunch workers. In other words, we are not going to be spending any more money from this day forward with this program for labor. As a matter of fact, the schools will spend much less money because they will have less workers involved and still feed 46.8 million children. The quantity of workers employed could be reduced on a natural retirement basis rather than by layoff.

If schools, without lunch programs, could be equipped with Large Scale Meal Delivery Systems, then the program is well established, we could go back and repair and update the other programs and save additional money. The savings are so great that we cannot ignore them. Every year, Food Service technology should improve to a point where additional savings would hopefully overcome the inflationary costs for food and labor which we must deal with in this type of consideration.

The basic problem is that we cannot expect the local school districts to pay this kind of costs. They don't have the money available. They are having a lot of problems back at the grassroots levels today maintaining their school systems, and to expect them to come up with additional money to do this job would not solve the problem. The eventual solution is to equip these school districts and help them get started now.

The eventual solution must be to give all children an equal opportunity.

When our committee sat on the original White House Conference on Panel V-4 and discussed school lunch programs, we heard statements that there was in fact a war on hunger and malnutrition in the United States. Well, let's plan to win this war by first equipping the army of food service workers with the proper tools instead of just adding more people and perpetuating inefficiency.

Local schools do not have the proper facilities nor proper equipment at this time to accomplish a 100% school lunch program, but they can do it with your help. The food service equipment industry shares the concern of this committee and the Congress over the great problem to cure the nutritional deficiencies of our children and we certainly pledge our support to you to do our part.

I am confident that if given the challenge of a Universal School Lunch Program, the food service equipment industry and the food industry will have the ability to support the needs of a Universal School Lunch Program, and I, personally, hope that you will proceed with it rapidly to solve these problems of children who do not have the capability to testify to their own needs.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I really believe that the Congress that develops the policy to provide nutrition for all American children in school proves its responsibility of

concern for all Americans and rightfully deserves to sit in the highest seats of authority.

Thank you very much for asking me to testify here before you today.

ESTABLISH WITHIN THE UNITED STATES A COMMITTEE FOR THE PURPOSE OF STUDYING THE CAUSES OF INFLATION

We should establish an independent committee for the purpose of studying the causes of inflation. This committee should consist of a top level independent, and non-political oriented group of representatives of the Congress, the Senate, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve, business, and labor representatives of the professions for the purpose of determining the causes of inflation. Thereafter, this committee should teach what they have learned to the American people, and to all levels of government, and after causes and effects are thoroughly understood, eventually recommend legislation for the cure of inflation.

Inflation and its effects can do more harm to our future plans to solve our nutrition problems than any other factor. Therefore, solving this problem must be our first priority.

Throughout the United States, all of our citizens are having to reduce their life style as a result of inflation. Less effective spendable income is causing extreme hardship on fixed income and low income groups, having the same nutritional effect as our last depression.

If this inflation is permitted to continue, the most adverse consequences imaginable can be expected. It is my view that the following are the causes of inflation: Increasing our money supply, controlling wages and prices, reducing taxes, eliminating convertibility of our currency to gold, removal of currency backing by gold, undisciplined runaway wage increases extracted by crippling strikes, deficit spending in our federal budget, no overall plan by the Congress and Senate to keep legislation within pre-determined spending limits in concert with the executive branch to stay within its budget, lack of indexing interest on bonds to cost of living, continuing of old federal programs that no longer contribute to their original good intent. All of these items are contributors to inflation.

A blue ribbon committee representing all segments of the economy holding hearings of all views, then writing their own conclusions, then teaching these conclusions to the populace . . . may, and only then gain the popular support of what are now unpopular and misunderstood principles of need to save our nation.

A series of meetings of this committee along with similar groups from other nations could develop a world-wide understanding of this universal problem.

Farmers are being adversely affected by inflation with nitrogen fertilizer costing two to three times as much as last year.

The increased prices in petroleum products for tractors, drying grains, and transportation to markets are well known.

Increased land costs, conversion of agricultural land to real estate development, and farm equipment cost increases are also contributing to increased farm costs and prices.

We doubt if any segment of our economy has been more adversely affected than the food service industry. We were experiencing a double digit inflation before it became apparent in other areas of our economy.

At a time when we are trying to as a national policy improve quantities of nutrition, the opposite is happening as portions of food served are diminishing with the increases of prices.

Since the White House Conference on Food, Health and Nutrition, we have developed an awareness of nutrition at a higher level than at any time in the history of our nation.

Many and varied programs with large expenditures of funds have been devoted to solve these National Nutritional Deficiencies.

However, at the same time, inflation has eroded the Standard of Living of the same group that the programs were to help. With the exception of minor imbalances either way, it is my opinion that inflation has taken away during this period more dollars than have been added, and that on a net balance we are nutritionally worse off than before.

In the end analysis, unless inflation can be stopped, food will become increasingly expensive, even more children will suffer, and hunger and malnutrition in the world will increase along with prices. Inflationary effect can be as destructive as a drought.

We cannot control droughts, but we can stop inflation. Stopping inflation should be our first order of priority; for without a solution here, all other solutions are valueless.

A BETTER HOLE

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, the oil companies have come in for a lot of criticism lately, and I have been one of the critics. We have to recognize, though, that there are different points of view. In the interest of fairness and balance I wish to insert in the RECORD an item which appeared in the Review and Outlook column of the Wall Street Journal, June 24, 1974:

A BETTER HOLE

It's easy to see why Rawleigh Warner, Jr., president of Mobil Oil Corp., happened to acquire a Purple Heart, a Bronze Star and a Silver Star during the big war. The fellow is intrepid. While the rest of his oil-industry colleagues huddle in the foxhole, shot and shell from Capitol Hill bursting overhead, Mr. Warner is out there with fixed bayonet, plunging through barbed wire, taunting the enemy with shouts, maneuvers and hand grenades.

His boldest move yet was to announce that Mobil was weighing a tender offer that would give it control of Marcor, parent of Montgomery Ward and Container Corp., neither of which produces energy in any form. It would take about \$500 million of Mobil's cash to do the trick, and of course Mr. Warner knew there would be instant screams from the halls of Congress that the bloated profits of the oil tycoons were not going into increased energy production, as advertised.

"Irresponsibility at its worst," said Sen. Thomas McIntyre of New Hampshire, whose outcry was typical of several. "I've lambasted the oil industry before, but this decision by the nation's third-largest oil company to spend more than three-fifths of its last year's profits to buy a non-energy enterprise leaves me absolutely outraged."

Senator McIntyre, though, doesn't seem to be aware of what's going on. Mr. Warner has single-handedly outflanked the Congress. His company has handsome profits, true enough. But Mobil also has a \$1.5 billion budget this year for capital expansion and exploration. It has led all oil companies in laying out cash for federal offshore oil leases, \$848 million since December, 1970. It is the most recent oil company to build a refinery here, at Joliet, Ill., the biggest grassroots refinery ever built.

It has, then, been no slouch in plowing money, borrowed and earned, into its energy

business. But how much money should a reasonably prudent man invest in a business that has to be operated out of a fox-hole? The decision to diversify, says Herbert Schmertz, Mobil's vice president of public affairs, came out of "a real concern over potential future restraints" on investment in U.S. oil and gas activities.

Isn't Congress about to peel away the depletion allowance, carve away foreign tax credits and make other changes to make the business less profitable? Are there not 3,500 bills pending before Congress that would, in greater or lesser degree, do the same? Isn't the government keeping exploration closed off the Atlantic coast? Hasn't it proposed banning Mobil and the other majors from joint bidding on offshore leases? Isn't the Federal Energy Administration's crude allocation program a direct subsidy to the independents at the expense of the majors? What about the continuing price controls on domestic crude and regulation of the wellhead price of natural gas? And isn't Sen. Stevenson's scheme to have the government get into exploration a direct threat to the private oil companies?

In short, there's almost nothing the politicians haven't thought of to discourage investment in the oil business. It's astounding that any of them should now be absolutely outraged when Rawleigh Warner refuses to hunker down under fire and goes out looking for a better 'ole. For bravery above and beyond the call of duty, he deserves the Congressional Medal of Honor.

PROSPECTS FOR THE 1974 ELECTIONS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the very capable Governor of my great home State of Arizona recently spoke to the Maricopa County Republican Committee about prospects for the 1974 elections. Governor Williams has done an outstanding job as the chief executive of our growing, progressive State in the booming Southwest. His speeches reflect his understanding of our contemporary life, and he prepares them with care. He speaks from the heart, and with wisdom, about the realities of political happenings today. His evaluation of the real issues before the country this fall deserve attention from all of my colleagues. I am hopeful that they will take time to read this analysis of events that occupy the headlines:

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR WILLIAMS

The burning political question of the day is, "How will the Republicans fare in the November elections in the atmosphere of Watergate?"

Opinions are freely available on almost every new program. That part of the media so determined to "get" Richard Nixon at whatever the cost to the welfare of our nation is already predicting we will go down to humiliating defeat. Over-confident Democrats are looking forward to the day when their machinations will have reduced the Republican party to impotence and they will ride high with a no-veto Congress to carry forward their wild and impractical ideas.

To this hogwash, I say that the future of the Republican party and Republican candidates in November depend—not upon Watergate but upon the quality of our candidates,

dissemination and popular acceptance of the great principles of Republicanism, and the determination of you and me to go out and win once again.

I have warned before, the Democrats are laying a trap by making the great issue of this year's elections for just what a few men did at Watergate. If we let them get away with it, perhaps we deserve to lose.

The issue is not Watergate. The issue is whether this state and this nation shall preserve and follow the Republican ideals that made us great, or whether we are to rocket into the wild blue yonder with a flock of ideas that will change this nation, depriving us of many of our freedoms, turning us toward welfarism, reducing us to a second- or third-rate power, choking the very free enterprise that provides a way of life that is the envy of all the world.

That, my fellow Republicans, is the issue. And when you go out and talk issues to those who will go to the polls in November I say you are heading for victory.

Let us discuss in more detail a particular fetish of the Democrats—the expansion of the Federal Bureaucracy and Centralization of Government in Washington.

Government spending at all levels costs us Americans more than we spend for food, clothing, shelter and private transportation, according to a rather astute observer, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, publisher and editor of the Tulsa, Oklahoma, Tribune.

This is the result of governmental aggrandizement that in the end will destroy us as a free society. It is the handiwork of those Democrats who believe in big brother government in which our every need and want is provided. Those Members of Congress who oppose, who pigeonhole, every effort of our President to bring back sanity into the Federal Government by putting a halt to more and more spending, giving controls back to the people, reducing the bureaucracy, encouraging free enterprise as the provider of all the good things we enjoy.

Tell that to the voters. It's our key to victory.

Why are we Republicans? For a good many valid reasons, to be sure. Let me tell you why some pretty good people are Republicans:

Says Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania: "Republicans prefer a vigorously pursued, moderate course to the frenetic spurts of radical remedies preferred by Democrats."

Mary Louise Smith, co-chairman of the Republican National Committee, knows why she is a Republican.

"I am a Republican because I don't believe that every problem can be solved by money and more money being thrown at it, resulting in bigger and bigger government."

Representative George Goodling of Pennsylvania says:

"The Republican Party favors making the people independent of rather than dependent on the Government, thereby making for strength in the people, and in turn for strength in Government."

And from Representative Bob Daniel of Virginia: "I am a Republican because I believe in individualism and self-reliance. These are the two characteristics of the American spirit that have most contributed to the development and prosperity of the United States, making our history the world's greatest success story. I believe that the Republican Party best exemplifies and promotes these two virtues."

There you have it. That's your campaign issue and the path to victory. Now get out and convince every voter.

I am sure that the President's Middle East tour has confounded his critics, the meanest of whom are forced to admit his journey is a success for the cause of world peace and to maintain America's position as the light of hope in a badly mixed up world.

I want to say a few things about the President and this Watergate matter.

The evidence turned over by the President to the House Judiciary Committee on April 30 clearly establishes:

That the President had no knowledge prior to March 21, 1973, of any coverup.

That the President never engaged in a criminal plot to obstruct justice.

That when he was first informed on March 21, 1973, about the coverup the President took prompt and effective action to investigate the facts.

That the President took effective action to assist the Department of Justice to get all of the facts before the grand jury.

That the President carried out his constitutional duty to enforce the law.

The President stated that he had "been reluctant to release these tapes not just because they will embarrass me and those with whom I have talked, which they will—not just because they will become the subject of speculation and even ridicule—which they will—and not just because certain parts of them will be seized upon by political and journalistic opponents—which they will."

He said he had "been reluctant because in these and in all the other conversations in this office, people have spoken their minds freely, never dreaming that specific sentences or even parts of sentences would be picked out as the subjects of national attention and controversy" and "because the principle of confidentiality is absolutely essential to the conduct of the presidency."

As to the evidence itself, several points should be made:

The tape of the conversation between the president and John Dean, his former counsel, on Sept. 15, 1972, does not in any way support Dean's testimony that the president was "fully aware of the coverup." The tape of Sept. 15 does indeed contain a passage in which the President congratulated Dean for doing a good job, but it was said in the context not of a criminal plot to obstruct justice as Dean alleges, but rather in the context of the politics of the matter, such as civil suits, countersuits, democratic efforts to exploit watergate as a political issue and the like.

It is clear from the recorded conversations that Dean did not fully inform the president until March 21, 1973, and even then held back some information he later testified to.

The transcript of March 21 shows that dean stated: "The reason that I thought we ought to talk this morning is because in our conversations I have the impression that you don't know everything I know and it makes it very difficult for you to make judgments that only you can make on some of these things..."

He then proceeded to detail for the President what he believed the President should be made aware of.

During the conversation, Dean described to the President the commencement of what he alleges was a coverup involving himself and others, implicit in these revelations, of course, is that the President was not involved but rather he was learning of these allegations for the first time. In fact, later in the conversation, Dean said: "I know, sir, I can just tell from our conversation that these are things you have no knowledge of."

Dean told the Senate Select Committee that the President "never at any time asked me to write a report (about what he had previously reported to the President verbally.)"

Compare this testimony with the transcript of a recorded conversation on March 22, 1973:

H. R. Haldeman: "I think you (Dean) ought to hole up for a weekend and do that and get it done."

The President: "Sure."

Haldeman: "Give it your full attention and get it done."

The President: "I think you need—why don't you do this? Why don't you go up to Camp David?"

Dean: "I might do it. I might do it."

The President: "Completely away from the phone. Just go up there and (inaudible). I want a written report."

Later in the same conversation, the President stated: "I feel that at a very minimum we've got to have this statement. Let's look at it . . . If it opens up doors, it opens up doors—you know."

Throughout the transcripts are repeated requests by the President for everyone concerned to tell the truth. Examples:

On April 14, 1973, the President told John Ehrlichman: "And you tell Magruder, now Jeb, this evidence is coming in, you ought to go to the grand jury. Purge yourself if you're perjured and tell this whole story."

Later in the same conversation the President told Ehrlichman that when he met with John Mitchell to advise him that "the President has said let the chips fall where they may. He will not furnish cover for anybody."

On April 15, 1973, the President instructed assistant attorney general Henry Peterson to relay to Gordon Liddy that he should cooperate in the investigation, since he had said he would not do so unless authorized by "higher authority." The President said: "I just want him (Liddy) to be sure to understand that as far as the President is concerned, everybody in this case is to talk and to tell the truth. You are to tell everybody, and you don't even have to call me on that with anybody. You just say those are your orders."

On the evening of April 15, 1973, the President told Dean: "Thank God. Don't ever do it, John. Tell the truth. That is the thing I have told everybody around here—tell the truth. All they do, John, is compound it. That Hiss would be free today if he hadn't lied. If he had said, 'Yes, I knew Chambers and as a young man I was involved with some Communist activities but I broke it off a number of years ago.' And Chambers would have dropped it. If you are going to lie, you go to jail for the lie rather than the crime. So believe me, don't ever lie."

As to what Dean should say about the President's actions, the President told Dean in that same conversation: "No, I don't want, understand when I say don't lie. Don't lie about me either."

These are times that try men's souls, especially Richard Nixon's.

They are times that demand the best of us, as human beings, as citizens of the greatest country on Earth, as good Arizonans.

Let us face up to our responsibilities, courageous in the face of adversity, loyal to the principles in which we believe, and giving of ourselves that our beloved country, our form of government and our way of life may grow and develop.

[From the Arizona Republic, June 20, 1974]
GOP DEFEAT PREDICTION CALLED "HOGWASH"
(By Bernie Wynn)

Gov. Williams delivered a thundering defense of President Nixon Wednesday night at a sparsely attended meeting of Maricopa County Republican precinct committeemen.

He told some 75 committeemen, office holders and candidates that the burning political question of the day is, "How will the Republicans fare in the November elections in the atmosphere of Watergate."

The media, particularly the segment "determined to get Richard Nixon," and over-confident Democrats, are predicting the GOP will go down "to humiliating defeat," he said.

"To this hogwash, I say that the future of the Republican Party and the Republican candidates in November depend—not upon Watergate—but upon the quality of our candidates, dissemination and popular acceptance of the great principles of Republicanism and the determination of you and

me to go out and win once again," Williams said.

Williams urged the committeemen to "go out and tell the truth" about Watergate to the voters, the truth that Nixon did not know what was happening.

The governor, not seeking re-election after eight years in the state capitol, said the evidence turned over to the House Judiciary Committee April 30 clearly establishes:

That the President had no knowledge before March 21, 1973, of any cover-up and that the President never engaged in a criminal plot to obstruct justice.

That when he was first informed on March 21, 1973, about the cover-up, Nixon "took prompt and effective action" to investigate the facts and get them before the grand jury.

That the President carried out his constitutional duty to enforce the law, not thwart it.

Williams said the evidence shows that the President urged John Dean, his chief adviser, to tell the truth and to instruct all those involved in Watergate to tell the truth.

"These are times that try men's souls, especially Richard Nixon's," the governor declared.

The committeemen ought to remind the voters, "even one or two people you run into in the supermarket," that President Nixon ended the Vietnam war, ended the draft, brought peace to the world and through the "new federalism" began to return power to the states.

"I am sure that the President's Middle East tour has confounded his critics, the meanest of whom are forced to admit his journey is a success for the cause of world peace and to maintain America's position as the light of hope in a badly mixed up world," Williams said.

County Chairman Charles Lemon scolded the precinct workers for lagging behind Democrats in the registration of new voters. The meeting was held in the First Federal Savings and Loan Association auditorium, 3300 N. Central.

Lemon announced that each precinct worker and deputy registrar is being asked to bring in two new voters by the close of registration for the primary election on July 26.

Mrs. Carolyn Gunther was named chairman of a county-wide voter registration blitz for the Nov. 5 general election, being launched in August.

THE AMERICAN VETERANS MOVEMENT

HON. DAVID TOWELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had a 2-hour meeting with six members of the American Veterans Movement.

At the outset, I think I should state that the American Veterans Movement is in no way connected with various veteran organizations calling themselves opposed to the war in South Vietnam; and, furthermore, they did not indicate in speech or action any desire to foster violent protest of our Government institutions.

What they are calling for are basically the same privileges and rights we have afforded other American veterans from past military conflicts. Most of the men associated with the AVM are Vietnam-era veterans.

Because of the vastly different psychological feelings in this country after our involvement in Vietnam as opposed to the aftermath of World War I or World War II and because of such outward appearances as long hair and a different dress code, most of the established veterans organizations have been hesitant, and in some cases outwardly rejected these men from full participation in the existing organizations.

And, yet, they are not calling for any more or any less than their just rights under the existing law.

I believe our Government and, indeed, our congressional committees should immediately look at the medical care being provided, the educational opportunities, and the job placement program being implemented by the Veterans' Administration.

I am distressed that these young men are being inundated with redtape and paperwork before they can even get the simplest review of their individual cases.

We as a nation have asked them to give of themselves in a very unpopular war. The least we can do is provide them with the benefits already available and possibly eliminate much of what seems to be useless paperwork.

FOURTH OF JULY

HON. CHARLES ROSE III

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when in our country's history, love of nation, respect for the flag, and just plain old-fashioned patriotism seem to be "square," it is my pleasure to tell this august body about a town in my district that has kept a tradition alive since 1795.

I am speaking of the observance of the founding of this great and glorious nation. I am speaking of the Fourth of July, which will occur this week. The town I refer to is Southport, N.C., which is located on the seacoast in lower Brunswick County.

Brunswick County is steeped with the history of America and nowhere more so than at Southport. This first celebration of the Fourth of July in this historic port town is lost in the fog of antiquity. Historians say that it was celebrated with "speeches, fireworks, and good southern cooking."

In 1974, as in years past, it has grown to not a one-day observance, but a week-long affair that draws patriots from every State in the Nation. It begins on the Saturday prior to the Fourth with a beauty pageant to elect the fairest of the fair, no easy task, I assure you. The 1974 queen is Miss Jennifer Rabon. She will preside over all the cultural events that make up this patriotic extravaganza which will be culminated by a parade on the morning of the Fourth. In addition, there will be the climaxing of this occasion honoring the birth of this greatest of nations with an old-fashioned fireworks display on the night of the Fourth.

A rather symbolic climax, I might add, since it was up the Cape Fear River back in the days before the Revolution began officially that the citizens of Wilmington and neighboring New Hanover County signified their displeasure with the unfair taxation of the colonies by England with a "fireworks display of their own involving the King's tax collector."

Despite the patriotic motive, or perhaps as an outshoot of the same theme, since it is love of family that has helped to keep this country great, the emphasis of the Southport celebration is on events involving the family.

I would like to digress at this point to mention what may well be an addition to the famed Guinness Book of Records. I am speaking of an ice cream sundae 330 feet long—one city block—that will be another highlight of the Fourth of July program. It will be prepared for consumption by children of all ages.

Southport is a quaint town that has entered the 20th century, witness Carolina Power & Light's construction of a nuclear energy plant nearby, without losing any of the charm that makes it a mecca for persons seeking the quiet life and respite from the often hectic world outside. It grew from a focal point for the generations of pilots who have guided ocean-going craft from all over the world up the Cape Fear River to the thriving port of Wilmington into a place with its feet firmly planted in the rich soil that nurtured this Nation and its head facing a modern world without losing its heart along the way.

This Thursday it will celebrate the 198th birthday of America in a way that used to be traditional, but, alas, is not anymore, all across the Nation. Oh, I know that there will be celebrations in other towns and cities. But I doubt if there will be any that will say, "This is my own, my native land," anymore than will the little town of Southport.

I hope my colleagues will join me in a salute to the people of Southport who have worked so hard to make this event one of such a reaffirmation of faith in America. And that is every resident in Southport, young and old.

And let me add that it will be my pleasure and honor to be a small part of that birthday celebration on Thursday, July 4.

TRIBUTE TO LEWIS DESCHLER, HOUSE PARLIAMENTARIAN

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1974

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute in a very personal way, to our retiring Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler.

As a freshman Member, some 12 years ago, I found the parliamentary maze of House floor proceedings somewhat bewildering at times when I occupied the Speaker's chair. Quietly, efficiently, and understandingly, Lew helped me to navigate successfully out of the parliamentary shoals. Like any other new Mem-

ber in similar circumstances, I came to rely heavily on Lew's expert counsel. I found that his very presence on the House floor, next to the Speaker's chair, which I first occupied with some trepidation, was reassuring.

As my responsibilities in the House increased, I had occasion to call upon him more frequently in his office to discuss parliamentary points in advance of floor consideration of pending legislation. Lew, in the finest tradition of the dedicated public servant, was always helpful, patient, and precise. I came to admire and respect him not only for his keen mind and his wealth of knowledge on parliamentary matters, but also for his very human qualities. He was warm and amiable and courteous despite the intense daily pressures under which he served as House Parliamentarian.

Having had the advantage of Lew's counsel, I regret that the same benefits will not be available to other Members in the future. However, I am partially consoled by the fact that Lew will continue to serve the House as a consultant while he completes his work on parliamentary precedents of the House of Representatives and parliamentary law in general.

To Lew Deschler, I would like to extend my thanks and aloha. It is my fervent hope that he and his wife, Virginia, will find it possible, during their hard-earned retirement, to spend some time enjoying themselves on the incomparable sunny beaches in my State of Hawaii.

THE NEED FOR A HARD CONGRESSIONAL LOOK

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court yesterday handed down decisions on two extremely important bank merger cases. Like any complex issue dealt with by the Supreme Court, these cases require a great deal of study and reflection before their complete import can be determined.

However, a preliminary reading of these cases does indicate both some significant positive conclusions on the part of the Court, as well as some adverse and disturbing aspects.

Perhaps the most important positive conclusion made by the Court is that for the first time the doctrine of potential competition has been clearly recognized as applying in bank merger and acquisition cases. This has been an open question for several years and now appears to be settled by the Court.

However, in applying the doctrine of potential competition to banking cases for the first time, a majority of the Court appears to have circumscribed the application of this doctrine to banking in such a way as to raise a serious question as to whether attempts to apply it in particular cases will have any real practical effect in halting the growing

superconcentration occurring in banking today, as well as achieving deconcentration of highly concentrated banking markets.

For example, the Court rejected the Justice Department's argument that a State is an appropriate "section of the country" in applying section 7 of the Clayton Act. It seems to me that the general framework of our banking laws and the fundamental premise on which the dual banking system is based is that the State is the fundamental arena for providing commercial banking services to the public. This was the basic thrust that Congress took in the passage of the McFadden Act in 1927, and has been followed many times in the adoption of banking legislation since that time.

Another disturbing feature of the majority view in these two cases is the apparent weight the Court wants given to the positions of bank regulatory authorities in judging whether in fact a potential competitor is likely to enter a new market. This, it seems to me, completely ignores the principal reason why Congress, in passing the Bank Merger Act amendments of 1966 and the companion amendments to the Bank Holding Company Act, provided that, in any action brought by the Justice Department against a bank merger or acquisition approved by any of the three bank regulatory agencies "the Court shall review de novo the issues presented." The reason Congress adopted such an unusual provision was precisely because it felt that the bank regulatory agencies in matters of antitrust and competition did not provide any special or particularly objective expertise that should be given unusual weight by the courts in deciding the issues before it.

In addition, Congress also provided that the agency whose decision was being attacked in court by the Justice Department could become a party to the case in opposition to the Justice Department's position. It could not fairly be argued that Congress wanted special weight to be given to the point of view of an agency with a vested interest in its own decision in light of the adversary position accorded it before the Court by the law. This is true despite the admittedly serious problems such a position raises in other contexts, such as government agencies being represented on both sides of a case.

Therefore, the Supreme Court's view on this issue seems to be counter to the congressional intent of providing for complete de novo consideration by the courts of the issues initially decided by the regulatory agency, with no special weight given to the views of banking agencies.

No doubt a careful study of these lengthy opinions will raise additional issues. All of these issues are of extreme and immediate importance if we are to preserve and revitalize the competitiveness of our banking system in this country. The competitiveness of this system is under very serious challenge at this time, particularly with regard to the dramatic growth of statewide banking systems in various States which are leading to the domination on a statewide basis of commercial banking by a handful of big city

banks and bank holding companies. This trend must be stopped.

In light of the Supreme Court's decisions yesterday, it may very well be necessary that decisive legislative action be taken by the Congress to preserve a competitive banking system. Because of this, this issue will be considered during the hearings of the Domestic Finance Subcommittee on bank holding companies and related matters later this summer.

TEMPLE ISRAEL SISTERHOOD ADOPTS SOVIET JEWISH FAMILY

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the misfortunes of the Soviet Jewish community and the continuing denial of human rights and freedom has rightly attracted the concern of people from throughout our Nation. In my own district men and women have opened their hearts and given their full support to help those who are seeking to emigrate from Russia and who have been denied rights we consider essential to our traditional liberties—the right to openly practice a religious and cultural heritage and the freedom to emigrate.

The Sisterhood of Temple Israel of Hollywood recently undertook a campaign in behalf of a family from Tbilisi, Georgia, U.S.S.R. This dedicated group of women from my community adopted this family, Isai Goldstein, his wife, Elizabeta Bicova, and a brother, Gregory Goldstein, and have undertaken a campaign to help them.

The plight of the Goldstein family, who were arbitrarily dismissed from their employment in 1971 when they applied for visas to go to Israel, came to the attention of Mrs. Jack Thaler of Los Angeles while traveling in the U.S.S.R. last fall. Mrs. Thaler met and befriended the Goldsteins and began to correspond with them. Subsequent letters from Russia were shared with the entire congregation of Temple Israel of Hollywood and with many other individuals in our community who want to help the Goldsteins settle in the country of their choice.

As the President travels to Moscow "in the name of peace," I join with all Americans in longing for true détente and meaningful friendship with all the people of the Soviet Union. But we as a country should not abide the denial of basic, universally recognized rights of any people to emigrate freely, without heavyhanded, oppressive impediments.

I would like to submit in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a communication I have received from Mrs. Thaler and Dr. Max Nussbaum, spiritual leader of Temple Israel of Hollywood, outlining the tragic circumstances in the lives of the Goldsteins and asking for congressional help to assist this family to leave the Soviet Union and emigrate to the country of their choice:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

HON. THOMAS M. REES,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN REES: Temple Israel of Hollywood recently "adopted" a family in the Soviet Union. It is in their behalf that that we are writing to you to ask you to help prevent gross violations of basic human rights.

Isai Goldstein, his wife, Elizabeta Bicova, and brother Gregory Goldstein of Tbilisi, Georgia, U.S.S.R. are three Soviet Jewish Physicists, who applied for visas to go to Israel, in 1971, and were refused. They were dismissed from their work and subsequently charged with "dissemination of Anti-Soviet propaganda" (Article 190(1) of the Soviet Criminal Code and Article 206 of the Georgian Criminal Code).

The charges are based on material confiscated from the Goldsteins' home by the KGB. Such things as letters from friends abroad, Hebrew Language Textbooks, and a copy of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights.

In April of 1973 the Goldstein brothers were arrested without a warrant and held incommunicado for several days. Even after their release, the charge of "slander against the State" has not been dropped and the Goldsteins are harassed almost daily. Their mail is often confiscated by the KGB, their internal passports have been taken away, confining them to Tbilisi, and most recently their telephone has been disconnected.

On December 29, 1973 Elizabeta Bicova Goldstein gave birth to a son. The Goldsteins would like their son to be reared in Israel. They have renounced their Soviet citizenship and were granted Israeli citizenship.

It is our hope that you will help them. Specifically, we ask you to write to President Nikolai Podgorny, Leonid Brezhnev and Alexei Kosygin at the Kremlin, Moscow, U.S.S.R., asking that charges against the Goldsteins be dropped, that they no longer be harassed, restore their phone, life-line to the outside world, and most important to ease their departure in order to settle in the country of their choice.

We further urge that you convey to the Soviet officials the solidarity felt on behalf of the Goldsteins, by all free people.

Cordially,

DR. MAX NUSSBAUM,
Mrs. JACK (Silvia) THALER,
Chairman, "Adoption" Committee.

LEWIS DESCHLER—PARLIAMEN-
TARIAN AND FRIEND OF CON-
GRESS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 27, 1974

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have, for many years, enjoyed the services of the world's greatest parliamentarian—a man of profound and universal genius, especially renowned for his ability to bring order and lucidity to even the most verbose and technically complex legislative problem.

When I first came to Congress in 1929, Lewis Deschler had already distinguished himself by outstanding accomplishments in the position of Parliamentarian. With superb and well-nigh omniscient professional competence, Lew Deschler, throughout his long career, has been able to endow his associates with the absolute

continuing assurance that all is right and well within this Chamber. His tremendous strength of character, unyielding integrity, awesome composure, and rare sense of balance have been the model for all observers and students of the legislative process.

In fact, there can be no real retirement for Lew Deschler since his heart and his thoughts will never be far from the House of Representatives which has been his life for almost a full half century. No man has spent more painstaking hours nor been more zealously devoted for so long a period of time—49 years—to the welfare of his country. Lewis Deschler has been our unerring guide through years of stress and turmoil, and he will continue to be our guiding presence, because Lew Deschler, Parliamentarian and friend of Congress, will never be forgotten.

I join with my colleagues in wishing him every success and happiness in all his future endeavors.

SLOVAK CATHOLIC FEDERATION PILGRIMAGE TO BE HELD IN WILKES-BARRE SUNDAY, JULY 7

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that the Eastern Region of the Slovak Catholic Federation will hold its annual pilgrimage this Sunday, July 7, at the Sacred Heart Church in my hometown of Wilkes-Barre.

The Holy Mass will be offered at 1 p.m. The pilgrimage has received the blessing of our Bishop, J. Carroll McCormick. Prayers will be offered for the Holy Year which His Holiness Pope Paul VI has declared for 1975.

Also, prayers will be offered for the success of the 41st International Eucharistic Congress which will be held during the Nation's Bicentennial in Philadelphia in 1976.

SS. Cyril and Methodius will be invoked for their prayers for the people in Slovakia and in the Captive Nations where their feast is celebrated on July 5. Their feast according to the new church calendar is on February 14.

The late Father Joseph Murgas, founder of the Wilkes-Barre parish and the Federation, known as the radio-priest, will be remembered. People in Slovakia honored him on the 45th anniversary of his death, which is this year.

Prayers will also be offered for the beatification of Sister Miriam Teresa Demanovich, born in Bayonne, N.J., of Slovak Byzantine parents. She was a nun of the Sisters of Charity, whose cause is sought by the Catholic War Veterans of New Jersey and the Knights of Columbus in Washington, D.C.

Msgr. Stephen J. Yanchuska is host pastor of the Wilkes-Barre parish and Father Francis Beeda, chairman of the pilgrimage, is assistant pastor.

Father Joseph V. Adamec, Chancellor

of Saginaw, Mich., diocese, will be the homilist.

Pilgrims from eastern Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York will take part in the pilgrimage.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Speaker, between late March and the first of May, I conducted a public opinion poll of my congressional district, the Fourth of Virginia. Included in this congressional district are several urban areas, a large number of suburban residents, and several rural counties.

I attempted to send a poll ballot to each postal patron in the district and about 10,000 were returned.

It was not surprising that the individuals responding to the poll picked rising prices as the most serious problem facing our Nation today.

Waste on welfare, excess Government spending, crime and the energy crisis were also cited as leading problems.

One question asked was in what areas should the Congress increase spending if it meant increasing taxes. The leading response was that taxes should not be raised for any reason.

Other participants felt that spending should be increased to find new energy sources, prevent crime, improve national defense, and clean up air and water.

Eighty-six percent favored the adoption of a constitutional amendment to end busing and 78 percent stated that the Federal Government was too large.

Although the primary function of this poll was to give people a chance to communicate with their Congressman, I believe the results are of general interest to this distinguished House.

I include them for the consideration of my colleagues.

RESULTS OF POLL

1. Should Congress pass a Constitutional Amendment to end busing for racial balance? Yes, 86 percent; no, 11 percent; and undecided, 3 percent.

2. Do you consider the issue of Watergate: Very important, 33 percent; important, 24 percent; somewhat important, 22 percent; and not important, 22 percent.

3. The attention being paid to Watergate by Congress is: Too much, 54 percent; sufficient, 31 percent; and not enough, 15 percent.

4. Do you think the President should: Resign, 29 percent; remain in office, 71 percent.

5. Should Congress end the practice of giving food stamps to people who are on strike? Yes, 71 percent; no, 19 percent; and undecided, 10 percent.

6. Should Congress pass a Constitutional Amendment to make abortion against the law? Yes, 25 percent; no, 64 percent; and undecided, 11 percent.

7. Should Congress continue to send arms aid to Israel? Yes, 50 percent; no, 30 percent; and undecided, 20 percent.

8. Should the Congress help build mass transit systems with money from highway gasoline taxes? Yes, 53 percent; no, 32 percent; undecided, 14 percent.

9. Should Congress pass some form of National Health Insurance? Yes, 53 percent; no, 31 percent; and undecided, 16 percent.

10. Some people say the Federal Government has gotten so big it can't do much of anything right. Other people say it is too small to cope with the big problems we face. Do you think the Federal Government is generally too big or too small? Too big, 78 percent; right size, 19 percent; and too small, 3 percent.

11. To deal with the energy crisis, which of the following should the Congress do:

A. Regulate the oil companies like public utilities? Yes, 55 percent; no, 28 percent; and undecided, 17 percent.

B. Use tax money to develop new energy sources? Yes, 67 percent; no, 23 percent; and undecided, 11 percent.

C. Roll back the price of gasoline even if it means less exploration for oil? Yes, 30 percent; no, 51 percent; and undecided, 19 percent.

D. Let the price of gasoline rise to encourage exploration for oil? Yes, 27 percent; no, 58 percent; and undecided, 15 percent.

E. End tax breaks that encourage exploration for oil in foreign nations. Yes, 63 percent; no, 22 percent; and undecided, 15 percent.

12. Who do you think is responsible for Watergate? A. High level Presidential Advisors, 33 percent; B. Committee to reelect the President, 26 percent; C. President, 17 percent; D. News Media, 10 percent; E. Democratic Party, 6 percent; F. Relatively low level Presidential Advisors, 5 percent; and G. Republican Party, 4 percent.

13. If it means reducing taxes, in what areas should the Congress cut spending? A. Urban Renewal, 23 percent; B. Highway Construction, 17 percent; C. Mass Transit Construction, 15 percent; D. Aid to Education, 10 percent; E. National Defense, 10 percent; F. Cleaning Air and Water, 7 percent; G. Fighting Drug Abuse, 6 percent; H. Veterans' Benefits, 4 percent; I. Social Security Payments, 4 percent; J. Finding new energy sources, 3 percent; and K. Crime Prevention, 2 percent.

14. What is the most important problem facing our Nation today. A. Rising Prices, 17 percent; B. Waste on Welfare, 12 percent; C. Excess Government spending, 10 percent; D. Crime, 8 percent; E. Energy Crisis, 8 percent; F. Big Federal Government, 7 percent; G. Protecting individual rights, 6 percent; H. Busing, 5 percent; I. Improving National Defense, 4 percent; J. Watergate, 4 percent; K. Protecting free enterprise system, 4 percent; L. Drug Abuse, 4 percent; M. Protecting the environment, 3 percent; N. Relations with other Nations, 3 percent; O. Education, 2 percent; P. Abortion, 2 percent; Q. Protecting minority rights, 1 percent.

15. If it means increasing taxes, in what areas should the Congress increase spending? A. Taxes should not be raised for any reason, 19 percent; B. Finding new energy sources, 15 percent; C. Crime Prevention, 14 percent; D. National Defense, 10 percent; E. Cleaning up air and water, 8 percent; F. Mass transit, 8 percent; G. Social Security, 7 percent; H. Fighting Drug Abuse, 6 percent; I. Aid to Education, 6 percent; J. Veterans' Benefits, 6 percent; K. Urban Renewal, 2 percent; L. Highway Construction, 1 percent.

TRIBUTE TO HOUSE PARLIAMEN- TARIAN—LEWIS DESCHLER

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a man

who has served this body with distinction and unsurpassed dedication for more than 46 years as Parliamentarian—Lewis Deschler.

First commencing his congressional service under then-Speaker Nicholas Longworth, Mr. Deschler's impartial and nonpartisan guidance and wisdom have been indispensable to all succeeding Speakers.

The continuity and stability that he has assured over the years during his tenure here in the House of Representatives have provided for an orderly process, guaranteeing majority rule and minority rights. And now, Mr. Deschler is in the process of compiling and recording the rules and precedents that he has both followed and established over the 46 years he has served the House of Representatives.

As he departs this Chamber, he leaves a legacy of integrity, honesty, and fair play that will always be remembered by those who knew him and those who knew of him. His unparalleled wisdom and keen knowledge of parliamentary affairs will be missed, as will his warm and personable manner.

I commend him for his competence, professional objectivity, and dedicated service to this Nation. And I wish he and his family the best of everything in the years ahead.

ABA PRESIDENT FAVORS IMPEACHMENT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in a June 14, 1974, Christian Science Monitor interview I insert at the conclusion of my remarks, Chesterfield Smith, the president of the American Bar Association, states his view that evidence now in the public record is sufficient to justify impeachment of President Nixon.

I agree entirely. While it would be to the political advantage of my party to have Mr. Nixon continue in office until the end of his term, this is overwhelmed by his Presidency's disadvantage to the Nation.

Mr. Smith also states his opinion that violation of oath of office is sufficient grounds for removal. I concur in this as well. The Constitution is explicit in its use of the phrase "high misdemeanor;" we are required to demand more from our Presidents than the simple avoidance of felonious acts—although there is ample evidence, some of it from his own mouth, that Mr. Nixon has committed these as well.

The Nation is now approaching a crisis unprecedented in our history. We are going to have to come to grips with the question of whether high office is a license to ignore the laws written to bind all American citizens, or whether high office carries with it high responsibility.

If we choose the latter course by removing Richard Nixon from office, as I believe we will, our 200th anniversary

will in fact be an occasion of regeneration and rebirth. For a while it appeared that the memorable symbol of the Bicentennial celebration was to be a Marriott hot dog stand. Now perhaps it will be the Constitution of the United States.

We could do worse.

BAR PRESIDENT WOULD VOTE IMPEACHMENT

(By Louise Sweeney)

(Staff correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—The head of the American Bar Association says that if he were a congressman today he would vote for impeachment of the President, and that if the vote on impeachment drags on till next spring the President should resign.

This represents the strongest stand on the President that Chesterfield Smith, president of the American Bar Association, has yet taken.

Mr. Smith said at a breakfast meeting here, "If I were a congressman now I would vote to have a trial in the Senate. Yes, I would vote for impeachment on the basis of evidence already given. . . . He has not enforced the law of the land. I feel that . . . law-enforcement leadership is missing for the presidency. He has been solicitous of the welfare of close associates who have been violating the law, therefore he has participated in a cover-up."

Asked how he would vote if he were in the Senate, Mr. Smith said, "There is enough evidence to convince me it's in the national interest that a trial be had in the Senate, but it has not yet reached the point where there is enough to vote for conviction in the Senate."

NOT DEPENDENT ON CRIME

At another point he said, "If the President has committed abuses of his office and violated his constitutional oath, I would remove him from office whether or not he had committed a criminal act."

Mr. Smith said that he preferred to get on with the vote in the House on whether or not to impeach. "But if the vote doesn't come, if it goes on to March or April—I'm changing my thinking some more—I may no longer oppose resignation" [by the President].

Earlier he had said he felt at first the President should not resign, because there was a segment of the people who thought resignation "was a liberal-Eastern-establishment-media concoction."

But he felt that further evidence—the President's voluntary disclosure of his tax returns and his transcripts of the tapes—"eliminated that feeling on the part even of his defenders. They no longer felt it was a totally political concoction of the Eastern-media-liberal establishment. They realize there are some facts which justify it."

"LEGISLATIVE TRIAL"

Asked to comment on suggestions that the decision of the Senate, if the President were tried there, could be appealed to the Supreme Court, he said, "I do not believe it's appealable. It's a legislative trial."

Mr. Smith praised James D. St. Clair, the President's counsel, for his professional attitude.

If the President did not obey the Supreme Court ruling he requested on special prosecutor Leon Jaworski's tape subpoena, "I'd say we'd have a revolution. . . . There are three branches of government, and the Supreme Court, which can't enforce a decision, is the one which interprets it. So he'd be not disobeying the Supreme Court; he'd be disobeying the Constitution."

He said he thought former attorney general Richard G. Kleindienst was guilty, "perhaps guilty of more than was bargained for

or was adjudicated." Noting that he thought the attorney general "had done properly in some tough situations," he nevertheless said he would have given him "a heavier sentence than Judge Hart gave" (a \$100 fine and a suspended one-month jail sentence).

He added, though, that he felt Mr. Kleindienst needed no more punishment than he had already been through; "but I am a little concerned with the deterrent effect on others."

LARGE SPACE TELESCOPE

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week, during House consideration of the appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, space, science, veterans and certain other independent agencies, I expressed my regret that the House Appropriations Committee had deleted the funds requested by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to support definition studies for the large space telescope for the forthcoming year. In that statement, I mentioned that Dr. Jesse Greenstein of the California Institute of Technology had been in communication with me in support of the LST. As you may know, Dr. Greenstein was chairman of an astronomy survey committee of the National Academy of Sciences whose report in 1969 evidently formed part of the basis for the Appropriations Committee's rejection of the proposed LST funding. I believe that Dr. Greenstein's current views on the LST are pertinent to the present discussion of the importance of the large space telescope project. I have attached Dr. Greenstein's remarks here for your consideration.

REMARKS ON THE LARGE SPACE TELESCOPE

(By Jesse L. Greenstein)

I take the liberty of forwarding herewith for consideration by the staff of the relevant committees of the House and Senate some purely personal remarks concerning the Large Space Telescope and the attitude toward it which was held by the Committee of the National Academy of Sciences Astronomy Survey. I served as Chairman of that Committee which has now been disbanded, and my remarks are personal but do reflect a full knowledge of what the panel that studied the Large Space Telescope ideas and what the Survey Committee itself felt about the LST. Since that time I have been involved with other scientists in discussion of the role of the LST and its desirability. I also serve on the Scientific Advisory Board of ITEK Corporation which is involved in some technical studies. Like any scientist devoted to the future of astronomy on the ground and in space, I am, of course, somewhat compromised by my enthusiasm for my own science. On the other hand, I am a ground based astronomer who has used all the largest telescopes in the United States for over 40 years.

I believe that the recommendations of the Space Panel of the Astronomy Survey which are given in Volume II of Astronomy and Astrophysics for the 1970's, published by the National Academy of Sciences in 1973, are excellent ones and the material in their introduction on page 100 is of particular relevance. I quote: "The Panel gave its highest

priority recommendation to the development of a series of large, accurately pointable observatories for work in the ultraviolet. The major goal in such a program should be a large space telescope (LST) with a defraction limited aperture of the order of 120 inches. . . . Thus, the LST will have a much greater general utility than just for ultraviolet astronomy.

"It may not be desirable to jump directly from the OAO to the LST. So much technological development would be required that the Panel believes that a series of ultraviolet space telescopes should be launched gradually building toward the LST."

The Astronomy Survey Committee studied the totality of recommendations from a series of panels and prepared a set of ordered recommendations of which the fourth was a program for x-ray and gamma-ray astronomy from a series of large orbiting, high energy astronomical observatories supported by construction of ground based optical and infrared telescopes. The ninth recommendation was for an expanded program of optical space astronomy leading to the launch of a large space telescope at the beginning of the next decade. (The details will be found in Volume I of Astronomy and Astrophysics for the 1970's, published in 1972 with detailed discussions on page 8 (which is called recommendations) and page 105 to 106.) Thus, while it is technically correct that the LST program was envisioned for the early 1980's and to be preceded by a program of intermediate sized ultraviolet telescopes, it is also true that the panel specializing in space astronomy had put the latter program as its highest recommendation even above HEAO.

I believe that the reasons for the Astronomy Survey Committee not having placed the LST programs among the first few of its priority recommendations should be outlined. Essentially, in preliminary discussions during 1970 with NASA management and budget planners, we were told that the probability of a new major undertaking like the Large Space Telescope being funded in the 1970's, which was the period under issue, might be viewed as small. For that reason we viewed the 1970's as a testing ground for intermediate sized ultra space telescopes and considered the latter in the context of the full program of ground based optical, radial, and infrared astronomy and space astronomy at all possible wave lengths. From that point of view, it was scientifically desirable to place the high energy astronomical observatory above the ultraviolet observatory sequence.

Since that time and, in fact, toward the end of the period of activity of the Survey Committee, the technical studies on a modest scale funded by NASA with industry had established more clearly the technical feasibility of preparing a suitable mirror, of preparing a structure which would be satisfactory against the thermal disturbances of operation in space, and, in particular, the detailed planning for the space shuttle made it apparent that the large investment in a very large telescope in space could be made a "low-risk" project rather than a one-shot investment in a large space telescope subject to the dangers of a minor malfunction. Astronomers on the ground are used to handling quite delicate equipment and to having to service and refurbish it continuously. In addition, they are used to a rather large assortment of auxiliary instruments which can be substituted on short notice. The flexibility of a large group of sensors now proposed for the LST, the possibility of changing them, the possibility of repair, refurbishment or retrieval all combine to make the cooperation between the manned space program and the automated telescope a very fruitful and promising one. The small technical studies that have been carried through have taken a few years. They

ought to be continued to the level where a well-defined cost and a clear statement of goals can be reached. If an LST is to fly in the 1980's, it must be studied now. The few years that have passed since the technical studies were available to our Panel and to our Survey Committee have greatly increased the confidence of astronomers in almost all branches as to the feasibility and scientific importance of the LST. I can call your attention to the group of papers published in the transactions of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics presented in January 1974 at their meetings.

As a reasonable advocate of a balanced program between theoretical astrophysics, observational astronomy from space and from the ground, I may say that had a program of orderly growth in size of small automated telescope been funded beginning in 1973, even more cogent reasons could have been presented for the flight by 1980 of a large space telescope, defraction limited and serviceable by man when needed. Since that opportunity has been lost and since the technology appears to exist to make a successful LST and to use it, it would be unfortunate to restart on the program of smaller automated telescopes leading to the LST. The impact of the small telescopes has been reduced while the scientific need for the important one-of-a-kind things that the LST can do has increased.

I cannot obviously predict what restudy now would say about the LST, the high energy astronomical observatory, or the ultraviolet automated telescopes. I am confident that had we not had in mind the budget limitations, the at that time unsolved technological problems, and had we fully realized the wide range of discovery that we had even in the last three years, we would not have taken quite so "conservative" an attitude. Astronomers felt then and feel now that the LST is the ultimate optical telescope and that together with a well-balanced, ground-based program, it will open new and imaginative vistas for the human mind to contemplate.

CONGRESSMAN NIX INTRODUCES FREE CONSTITUENT MAIL BILL

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced two bills which I believe will go a long way toward improving communications between Congress and the public. In these days of mounting public skepticism of the political process, I believe that we in Congress should do all we can to strengthen the ties between citizens and their Representatives in Congress.

The first bill I have introduced would enable constituents to send mail to their Congressmen at no cost. Members of Congress now have the right, under the franking privilege, to mail to their constituents at no cost. This bill would allow their constituents the same privilege.

My bill would also direct the Postal Service to maintain a supply of pre-addressed mailing forms at every post office for use as mail to Members of Congress. These forms would be sold at reasonable cost by the post office and would provide citizens with an easy way of forwarding their views to the Representatives in Washington.

Communications between Congressmen and constituents are essential to our democratic form of government. We in Congress, who must spend a good part of our time in Washington, rely on our mail to keep in touch with the opinions, problems, and desires of our constituents. By allowing our constituents to write to us free of charge, we will demonstrate that we not only accept their right to communicate with us, we encourage it.

My second bill would also serve to improve communications between Congress and the public. It would provide for the publication of a Weekly Digest of congressional activities, based on the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Today, the citizen who is interested in government and who wants to follow developments in Congress is in a very poor position to do so. Daily newspapers, which at one time devoted a large amount of space to Congress, now provide only sketchy coverage. Coverage by the other media is similarly limited. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of course, reports the proceedings in Congress fully. But very few citizens have the time or the access to read the Record. And the private services that cover Congress are not designed or priced for the average citizen.

I believe that this information gap can be bridged by publishing a weekly digest of congressional activities. Published under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, the digest would consist of a summary of congressional proceedings for the week, similar to the information now contained in the Daily Digest section of the daily Record.

The Digest could be widely distributed at low cost, and would be easily available to schools, libraries, and interested citizens. With this service, citizens could follow the consideration of legislation that affects their lives. And it would greatly expand the people's knowledge of how their Government works.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the enactment of these two bills would do much to restore the confidence of our citizens in their Government. It is time that we, members of the "people's branch of Government, take positive steps to reinvigorate the democratic spirit of our representative form of government.

LEW DESCHLER

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, as I look around this Chamber, I see only three faces who were here on that day 40 years ago when I took my first oath of office as a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois. One is my colleague from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, who preceded me by 6 years. Another is also a colleague from Texas, Mr. MAHON, who began his service that same day. And the third is a gentleman who has never sought elective office but is in my judgment one of the greatest public servants the Congress—and indeed the Nation—has ever known.

He is Lewis Deschler, who is retiring after 49 years of service in this House—46 of them as our distinguished Parliamentarian.

Yes, Lew Deschler was one of the first persons I met when I came to Washington 4 decades ago, and ours has been a warm and deepening friendship ever since. We have had many things in common, but one thing in particular—a deep respect and concern for the integrity of the House of Representatives and its constitutional role in our system of government. I know of no individual who has contributed more toward this objective than Lew Deschler. Certainly no Parliamentarian in the history of the Congress has achieved such an impressive record.

Lew has served here during five of the most colorful and challenging decades in our history. The issues which have come before the House in this period have been difficult and sensitive ones, tough questions having great impact on our society. It has been a period when Speakers and Members alike have needed wise and fair counsel—a time when it would have been easy to lose our sense of direction and balance and accede to political excesses in the interest of expediency. But I have never known Lew to compromise parliamentary principles for such purpose, nor have I known him to be partisan in his opinions. As Republican whip for these past 31 years I have had innumerable occasions to seek his advice and guidance. His door was always open to me and other Members of the minority, his counsel straightforward and freely given.

Lew could have found fame and fortune in many ways, but he chose to make his post in the House his life work. For this we owe him our deepest gratitude, for he has rendered a high caliber of service beyond expectation. His has been a pursuit of excellence, both for himself and this House. Certainly his retirement years are well earned, and I wish for him and his wife Virginia good health and abundant happiness in the years ahead.

The "Deschler Precedents" which will soon be completed will be a monumental tribute and a source of inspiration and guidance for those who follow in these Halls. They will be studied by legislators and students of government for years to come. They will be a written legacy which will live on throughout our history.

For those of us here today, we can add to this our own memories of Lew Deschler, the man, as we have known him—friend, gentleman, scholar, patriot, Parliamentarian, American. These are memories I shall always cherish.

INDEPENDENT GASOLINE DEALERS SHOULD NOT BE FORCED TO DO BUSINESS ON THEIR KNEES

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting I held with independent gasoline dealers in my district this past January,

it was bluntly brought to my attention that many oil companies, both major and otherwise, were canceling leases with their lessee-dealers without just and warranted cause whatsoever. In most cases, what had once been a 3-year lease suddenly became a 1-year contract with an addendum clause allowing for either party to cancel the contract with as little as 60 days', and often 24 hours', notice.

This practice was not limited to one or two oil companies. Almost without exception dealers representing many major and independent brands expressed alarm at not only the new limitations on their contracts, but the actual termination of contracts containing these new provisions.

Most of the more than 100 independent lessee-dealers at my January meeting were lifelong businessmen who had established a good relationship with their major or independent affiliates, and had helped to influence sales for their companies by years of dedication and hard work. Suddenly they found themselves on the brink of immediate unemployment at the complete discretion of the oil companies.

In talking with representatives of several major oil companies, I am told that a small percent of the total retail outlets are company operated—that the remainder are leased to independent operators. But they readily admit that the tenure of contracts being offered to their dealers is being shortened and in many cases contain the right to cancel leases with as little as 24 hours' notice.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that such practices are a gross injustice to the independent businessman who cares about the quality of service being given to his customers, and who depends on his station to sustain his family's livelihood, to say nothing of the pride he takes in being a part of the business community. Whether the oil companies have in the past been lightly involved in the direct retail marketing of gasoline is immaterial to the clear intent being expressed by shortened and qualified leases. I submit to this body that not only is it unfair to the independent businessman and his family to suddenly find themselves unemployed without good reason, but it is also unfair and anticompetitive to the American gasoline consumer to allow the branded oil industry to achieve greater control in the retail marketing sector.

I recognize the greater profitability of retailing gasoline and I believe this, and only this, is the reason for such a dramatic turn-around in the nature of leases and renewal offers being given to independent dealers. Is it fair to the businessman, his family, or the consuming public to allow greater control by the branded oil industry? Would the majors and large independents improve overall service to the community, or would they emphasize gasoline sales and deemphasize or eliminate other services which automobile owners expect and need? Would they provide more jobs in the community by retaining or improving overall service, or would less jobs be available if other services were deemphasized? Would competition thrive with fewer independent businessmen competing for our gasoline dollars?

Mr. Speaker, I believe these questions are important not because of today's impact of marketing control by the branded companies, but because of the potential and anticompetitive impact which such practices could and would have in the gasoline marketplace in the future. I believe it is important enough that the Congress must take steps to insure that independent businessmen are not forced out of business unless and until certain reasonable and justifiable circumstances prevail.

I have introduced a bill which provides protection to independent dealers against the unjust unwarranted cancellation of leases. Under my bill, which has been joined by 43 cosponsors from 24 States, a lease could not be canceled, nor could there be a failure to renew, unless the dealer has failed to comply substantially with any essential or reasonable requirement in his lease, or unless the dealer has failed to act in good faith in carrying out the terms of his lease. The bill has the active support of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, a national trade organization which, along with its State affiliates, represents more than 80,000 independent branded dealers nationwide.

Congress must act to preserve the independent sector of gasoline retailing; if, for no other reason, this must be done to assure the consuming public that competition in gasoline marketing will serve as the best stimulant for restrained prices. To assure the consuming public of this vital requirement, something more than simply a landlord-tenant relationship must be established in the marketing end of gasoline. I believe the bill I have introduced would create such a situation, because it would serve to establish the rights and remedies of independent gasoline businessmen, who should be more than simply tenants under the direction of the oil companies.

A hearing before the Office of Consumer Protection of the State of Louisiana, on January 28, 1974, disclosed that the Gulf Oil Co. was the most prominent in the area of contract cancellations in Louisiana, although Exxon and Murphy Oil were also engaged. That same hearing also disclosed that dealers of other companies were offered leases on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, and were often encouraged not to consult an attorney. In the State of Oregon it was alleged that major oil companies were threatening cancellation of leases if dealers did not purchase additional tires, batteries, and accessories. Another dealer was given only 48 hours' notice without regard to the provisions in his contract regarding notice requirements.

Instances referred to in the previous paragraph were documented in testimony submitted to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but are illustrative of what is happening in not only these States but in Missouri and throughout the Nation. I am told, and am in the process of getting this information documented, that, upon learning that I had introduced a dealer-protection bill, Exxon included in its dealer contracts a provision stating that the lessee agreed that "parties hereto have and do hereby agree that all of the

covenants and provisions of this agreement are mutually satisfactory, are fair, essential, and reasonable in all respects, and that any breach of any covenant or provision shall be deemed for any purpose as substantial."

Earlier this year major oil companies were buying expensive ads to plead with the American people to reduce their purchases and consumption of gasoline. Now I understand some of these same companies have advised their dealers that, if they do not increase their gasoline sales, they will terminate their leases.

I am also in possession of what is called an "allocation addendum to contract being offered to lessee-dealers by Mobil. The addendum refers to the main contract and is an effort, I believe, to not only allow termination for almost any cause with very little notice, but is a way by which the mandatory allocation program can be circumvented. The contract addendum reads as follows:

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary, this Contract is expressly conditioned on the following additional overriding terms:

1. The parties acknowledge that but for the agreements contained in this addendum, Mobil would not have entered into this Contract. In the event that any part of this addendum is found to be unenforceable for any reason whatsoever, then this entire Contract shall be immediately void and no part thereof shall be enforceable, except that Customer shall pay for goods sold and delivered by Mobil prior to the date the contract is voided.

2. In the event that Mobil determines that allocation is required to enable Mobil to comply with any governmental request, order, guideline, rule, regulation or law, relating to allocation, whether voluntary or mandatory, Mobil reserves the right to take any of the following actions, all of them, or any combination of them:

(a) Cancel this Contract.
(b) Allocate such quantities to the Customer herein as Mobil may determine.
(c) Suspend or cancel deliveries during such period or periods as it may determine it requires to resolve uncertainties raised by such governmental requests, orders, guidelines, rules, regulations or statutes.

3. Mobil shall not be liable for loss, damage or demurrage due to any delay or failure in performance by reason of the foregoing, nor shall Mobil be required to make up any deliveries or quantities omitted as a result of the foregoing.

4. Mobil's determination, in all instances referred to in this addendum and Mobil's decision to take any action provided for in this addendum shall be made in its sole and absolute discretion, shall be conclusive as to all operative facts required therefor and no part of any such determination or decision shall be open to question provided only that the determination and/or decision was arrived at in the ordinary course of business under the circumstances.

5. This Contract shall not be valid unless this addendum is executed and agreed to by Customer and Mobil.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the foregoing addendum to a contract for lease is filled with ways by which the mandatory allocation program can be circumvented and by which the Mobil Oil Corp. has complete authority over the retailing of gasoline sold under their brand, if they desire to exercise the many options in the addendum.

From my contacts with independent

dealers, trade associations, and oil companies, I believe that the entire spectrum of independent retailing is in jeopardy, because of contracts providing for almost immediate termination at the discretion of the branded company. I do not believe this is fair, right, or justifiable—nor do I believe the American public should be submitted to an environment of increasing oil company involvement in gasoline retailing. We speak of the economic dangers of integration in the oil industry, but if we allow further encroachment in retailing we are certain to provide a mechanism for higher consumer prices down the road.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION DUCKS THE REAL ISSUE

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised but not shocked to learn that the National Education Association is developing a course during their annual convention on how to deal with Watergate and the impeachment process from the elementary grades through high school. Interestingly enough, the speaker's rostrum was scheduled to be loaded with anti-Nixon speakers. Thus the NEA avoids the real issue of today in education—the failure to teach. With test scores in all areas dropping across the Nation and alarming new discoveries of the lack of ability to read in our children, Watergate provides one more excuse for the NEA to avoid these unpleasant facts. This Nation has survived wars, civil war, depressions, scandals of all sorts, but it may not survive if we continue to cheat our children out of an adequate education under the guise of "educating the whole child." It is high time we got back to phonics and fundamentals and stopped playing politics in education. The article from the District of Columbia Star-News of June 30, 1974 follows:

[From the Washington Star-News, June 30, 1974]

U.S. TEACHERS STUDY "WATERGATE CURRICULUM"

(By John Mathews)

CHICAGO.—How to deal with Watergate and the impeachment process—from elementary school social studies to high school democracy courses—is a dominant concern of the approximately 10,000 teachers and school administrators at the National Education Association meeting here this week.

Calling its 112th annual convention "Crisis in Conference 1974: Challenge for the Classrooms," the 1.5 million-member NEA has developed its own "Watergate Curriculum," designed to cover kindergarten through high school. The classroom materials deal with values, morality and ethics—areas many teachers have carefully avoided out of fear of creating controversy.

"I know some parents will object that teachers should not treat moral issues and politics," said Helen D. Wise the NEA president. "But as teachers we must dispell the cynicism many students now have about government and we can deal with that only by

having students find out what happened and why and what can be done about it."

Compiled by a task force of teachers, the "Watergate Curriculum," begins at the elementary school level with an object lesson on how to handle a playground problem. Several children want to jump rope at the same time, so Mr. Harris, their teacher, sits them down to think up solutions, the curriculum pamphlet shows.

A list of alternatives is compiled, including "stealing the rope for yourself" or taking turns, cutting the rope in half or buying more ropes. Rules are then set democratically for sharing the rope, play begins, but somebody cheats. This prompts another lesson in "playing fair," which will hopefully lead the children to the conclusion that once laws are adopted they must be followed.

For junior high students, the curriculum becomes more direct with a "Watergate Pre-test" that includes questions like: Which former Attorney General under President Nixon is implicated in the Watergate cover-up? Who was the individual who told the Ervin Watergate Committee that he informed the President of the cover-up? Rose Mary Woods is (choose one answer) a. U.S. district judge, b. John Mitchell's personal secretary, or c. President Nixon's personal secretary.

The high school curriculum unit on impeachment describes the constitutional background and history and carefully sets out the contrasting views held by James D. St. Clair, the President's lawyer, and John Doar, the majority counsel of the House Judiciary Committee, of what constitutes an impeachable offense.

The curriculum materials try hard to keep a balance, according to Frank Kovacs, a former District and Montgomery County, Md. teacher who is now an NEA staff aide for the Watergate task force.

"We really have had a tough time presenting the President's side," he said, "because if you use his speeches or the tapes there are so many contradictions that it hurts more than it helps."

The list of speakers at a two-day "critical issues" conference that preceded the convention's business sessions beginning today made no attempt to keep a balance of pro- and anti-impeachment proponents. NEA President Wise acknowledged that the speakers were "very liberal and may be slanted." They included such liberal Democrats as historians Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Henry Steele Commager and John W. Gardner, the chairman of Common Cause.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON THE ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Small Business Problems in Smaller Towns and Urban Areas, which I have the privilege of chairing, will hold hearings on the role of small business in community development. The purpose of these hearings is to examine the impact and effectiveness of Federal programs, policies, and regulations in offering small businesses the opportunity in all phases of community development which includes urban, suburban, and rural areas.

These hearings will be held on July 10 and 11 at 10 a.m. in room 2359 of

the Rayburn House Office Building. Those who wish to submit a statement for the record should contact the counsel assigned to the subcommittee, Michael Ward, at 255-4881.

INDIANA DUNES NATIONAL LAKESHORE

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago the House Interior Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation held a day of hearings on a bill to expand the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. Since I am the principal sponsor of this proposal I would like to include in the RECORD the outstanding testimony presented on the part of the United Steelworkers of America.

The item follows:

The United Steelworkers of America (AFL-CIO) wishes to extend its full support to H.R. 3571, H.R. 12970 and H.R. 14141, identical bills to expand the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore sponsored by Congressmen Roush, Madden, Brademas and twenty-three of their colleagues. We urge prompt consideration by the House Interior Committee and support its passage without deletions.

Northwest Indiana is the center of one of the nation's principal concentrations of the basic steel industry. The United Steelworkers represents employees of all the major steel companies located in this region, as well as workers employed by the local utility, Northern Indiana Public Service Company (NIPSCO). Our Union's District 31, with over 135,000 members in Indiana and Illinois, is on record in support of an earlier and somewhat more expansive Dunes bill introduced by Congressman Roush in the 92nd Congress, and nothing has transpired since then to alter our support for an enlarged National Lakeshore park. In fact, your committee is in receipt of a letter from our District Director, Samuel Evett, dated June 14, 1974, reaffirming a previous supporting policy.

Although about 40 percent of the area proposed for addition to the park in current bills is zoned for industry, the entire 5,300 acres of park additions represents less than 1 percent of the area of the three counties involved. We do not believe that it is essential to develop these lands of such high recreational value contained in the Roush bill as though they comprised the only acreage available for industry in this region.

At hearings on H.R. 3571 held in Washington on June 17, 1974, Bethlehem Steel, National Steel's Midwest Steel Division and NIPSCO all submitted testimony opposing this bill. These were the only corporations to do so, and their statements can be readily summarized. First, they oppose any enlargement of the National Lakeshore park at this time. Furthermore, they desire that all the property that they own that has been proposed for addition, and in some cases additional property that they do not own, be deleted from any park expansion proposals, now and in the future. The deletions recommended by the three corporations amount to about 1,485 acres, or 28 percent of the area of the bill.

Each of the major industrial opponents of H.R. 3571 maintain that this badly needed legislation would obstruct future industrial expansion in Northwest Indiana and prevent the creation of new jobs. We cannot agree

with this view, resting as it does upon only a selective presentation of facts by company management. We call the subcommittee's attention to significant omissions in each of the statements of Bethlehem, National and NIPSCO that have great relevance to the Steelworkers' support for this legislation.

In its testimony of June 17, Bethlehem Steel's primary substantive objection to H.R. 3571 concerned the company's future expansion:

"One area proposed for inclusion as park land is a section of the Little Calumet River, which bisects the Bethlehem acreage on the south side of Highway 12. Including this area—referred to as Section IV C in the proposed bill—would, for all practical purposes, cut off the approximately 1,200 acres of our property that extends south of the Little Calumet River."

The company, however, fails to acknowledge or comment upon Section 12 of the text of the bill, which safeguards existing rights-of-way across the river and authorizes the granting of additional points of access across the river in the future.

We too are concerned with guaranteeing Bethlehem's ability to expand its Burns Harbor plant. Accordingly, our Union has, on several occasions and at various levels, been in contact with the bill's sponsors and conservationist representatives on precisely this point. We find that the provisions of Section 12 are adequate to meet our common concern regarding plant expansion, and that inclusion of Unit IV C in the National Lakeshore presents, at worst, a managerial inconvenience well within the company's capability to surmount. The Little Calumet River corridor need not be dropped from the bill.

The Midwest Steel Division of National Steel has also cited its prospects for expansion as a rationale for deleting portions of the park area, in this case Unit I-C and the eastern portions of Unit I-B. The company has conceded that these areas would not be used for steelmaking facilities, but rather for an industrial park of satellite consumers of steel. However, National failed to inform the subcommittee that the company holds a landfill permit for 200 acres of Lake Michigan, directly north of its present mills located east of Burns Ditch and abutting Burns Waterway Harbor. This concession from the State of Indiana provides National with a large parcel well situated for future development of steelmaking facilities and/or industrial park facilities for satellite consumers of steel at this plant. Or, the proposed satellite industrial park can be located elsewhere within the ample expanse of industrially zoned land in the City of Portage. Jobs will not be sacrificed by preserving Units I-B and I-C in their natural state.

Finally, Unit II-A is opposed by NIPSCO on the grounds that its present use by the company is compatible with the adjacent National Lakeshore lands, and that its status as part of a buffer zone around its proposed Bally Nuclear Power Plant might be undermined. In reality, very little of the nuclear plant's proposed buffer zone, which encompasses a 1.5 mile radius from the plant site, is now owned by NIPSCO. Furthermore, Congressman Roush has testified that his bill is not a device for killing off the utility's nuclear plant proposal. We accept this statement at face value.

Most importantly, NIPSCO has omitted reference to its continuing abuse of the wetlands of Unit II-A. The company uses this area, a part of the Cowles Bog basin, as a dump site for fly ash produced by the existing coal-fired plant on the Bally tract. This crude practice has already resulted in adverse effects on the adjacent bog, a registered National Natural Landmark. Unit II-A must be added to the National Lakeshore, not to undermine the company's nuclear application, but to safeguard this landmark area for public use.

In closing, we reiterate that H.R. 3571 will not have a debilitating effect on industrial expansion in Northern Indiana. Our Union's membership will actually be among those best served by a national park of the size and diversity envisioned in H.R. 3571. Quality recreation close to home is an elusive goal for much of the nation's urban workforce, yet more highly prized than ever due to the current price and uncertain supplies of gasoline. Our membership, and the country at large, will greatly benefit from the prompt enactment of H.R. 3571 in its entirety.

I request that this letter be inserted in the hearing record.

THE HONORABLE PAUL H. NITZE TESTIFIES BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ON SALT

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today the Subcommittee on Arms Control and Disarmament, which I chair, of the Committee on Armed Services, was privileged to hear from the Honorable Paul H. Nitze, who recently resigned as Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for SALT and as a member of the U.S. delegation to SALT, is a real expert in this field and a man dedicated to public service.

His testimony was both enlightening and somewhat disquieting in several respects. Without going into any great detail on the matters we heard this morning, I would state that it is apparent from Mr. Nitze's testimony, and from that of several other individuals, that the Congress must exercise a more effective oversight role in decisions of this gravity, and the manner in which these decisions are reached, than has been done heretofore. Experience has shown us that it is simply too late to responsibly question the products of these agreements after they are completed.

I intend at this time to insert Mr. Nitze's opening statement into the Record and urge that all of the Members take the opportunity to read his remarks:

REMARKS OF PAUL H. NITZE

In June 1972 I supported approval by the Congress of the SALT Interim Agreement on the basis that it was, in essence, a short term freeze on new ICBM and SLBM launcher starts; it was not to prejudice the scope or terms of the permanent agreement which both sides had agreed should be more negotiable by virtue of agreement on the ABM Treaty and such a freeze.

The position taken by the U.S. Delegation during the subsequent SALT TWO Geneva negotiations was based on the concept of equality, or essential equivalence, between the United States and the Soviet Union in basic verifiable limitations on those weapon systems whose principal role is the nuclear strategic role. Equal limitations would apply to the number of ICBM and SLBM launchers and heavy bombers, the throw-weight of MIRVed missiles and the destructive capability of the strategic forces of the two sides as measured by the throw-weight of offensive nuclear missiles with an allowance for the equivalent capability of heavy bombers, tak-

ing into account the absence of limitations on anti-aircraft defenses. There would be a provision not to circumvent the agreement through the deployment of other nuclear capable systems not specifically limited.

The position taken by the Soviet side was heavily one-sided in the Soviet favor. It would carry over into a permanent agreement the approximately forty percent Soviet superiority in the number of offensive nuclear missile launchers and preserve the Soviet advantage in missile launcher dimensions provided by the Interim Agreement. It would negate U.S. offsetting advantages in MIRV and heavy bomber capabilities. Furthermore, it called for the withdrawal of nuclear capable systems deployed in defense of U.S. allies and capable of striking Soviet territory and the liquidation of the associated bases. It would ban the deployment of new U.S. systems such as Trident and B-1, but would not ban the deployment of the new family of Soviet offense systems now under active development or deployment. Reductions would be put off until the indefinite future.

The Soviet position was undoubtedly an extreme asking positions, with extensive builtin trading room. The question at issue is that of how best to bring the Soviet side around to acceptance of a permanent agreement which will result in permitting U.S. strategic forces not inferior to those of the Soviet Union contribute to maintaining crisis stability and provide a basis for reducing the strategic arms competition between the sides.

There are a number of underlying problems to be solved. The first has to do with the concept of equity. The U.S. Delegation's position has been consistent with that of the Congressional resolution approving the 1972 agreements. It has not called for strict equality in every category of strategic arms but has called for essential equivalence with respect to the overall mix of strategic offensive systems.

The Soviet side has consistently used the term "equal security with no unilateral advantage to either side." In their explanations of this term they insist that "geographic and other considerations" must be taken into account in determining what is equal security. Among these considerations is their view that the USSR is surrounded by hostile countries including the NATO countries and China, while the United States has on its borders friendly countries—Canada and Mexico. They argue that they therefore need substantially larger strategic forces than does the United States. They do not consider it pertinent that the European NATO countries have absolutely no interest in attacking the Soviet Union, that one can see no interest that China could have in attacking the Soviet Union, or that a state overtly preaching a doctrine of general hegemony is bound to find other nations looking to their defenses.

Secondly, the Soviet Delegation has refused to discuss the applicability of Article 12 of the Basic Principles of Relations between the U.S. and the USSR, signed in Moscow in May 1972 which provides that those relations will not affect obligations to other countries earlier assumed. I see no way in which a proposal that nuclear capable systems, deployed pursuant to commitments to NATO earlier assumed, be withdrawn, can be consistent with this Article.

I believe that it is not possible to achieve Soviet agreement on essential equivalence in the main strategic systems until the issue of withdrawal of nuclear capable systems, deployed pursuant to previous commitments to allies, is eliminated and the issue of the relative capabilities of nuclear capable systems not specifically limited by the agreement, both in the theatre context and in the intercontinental context, has been argued out.

A third issue is that of an agreed schedule of reductions to be made part of a permanent agreement. I see no way in which essential equivalence is to be achieved unless the U.S. builds up to the Soviet levels or both sides reduce to agreed lower common ceilings.

A fourth issue is that of MIRV limitations. Because of the time sensitivity of this issue, Dr. Kissinger, in May of this year, attempted to achieve what he referred to as a conceptual break-through on this subject; that is, agreement on the principle that the MIRV throw-weight of the two sides be equal. Such an agreement would have accepted the negation of one of the principal offsetting U.S. advantages which made the inequalities favoring the Soviet side contained in the Interim Agreement acceptable to the U.S. side in 1972. The Soviet side turned down Dr. Kissinger's proposal and countered with a proposal based on roughly equal numbers of MIRVed launchers on both sides. Acceptance of this proposal would have resulted in a substantial Soviet superiority in MIRV throw-weight coupled with a continuation of the very great Soviet superiority in un-MIRVed Soviet missile throw-weight. It is difficult to see how the U.S. strategic bomber capability, as offset by Soviet superior and unlimited air defenses, could offset these superiorities.

A number of other MIRV options designed to find negotiable ground between the Soviet proposals and the U.S. proposal have been analyzed. Of these only one appeared to me to be strategically desirable and possibly negotiable. This option would provide for a simple undertaking that neither side would deploy or further test large MIRVed missiles. This would cut off the further testing or deployment of large Soviet MIRVed missiles but would also ban testing or deployment of a large MIRVed follow-on missile to the U.S. Minuteman, and would, in my view, enhance the security of both sides by helping to maintain crisis stability. Despite this consideration, it may not have proven feasible to obtain Soviet agreement thereto. But one never really knows what is negotiable unless one tries.

The final issue is that of the differing views of the two sides as to how a permanent agreement is to be achieved. It has been the U.S. position that a permanent agreement should be a balanced overall agreement, to replace the Interim Agreement, negotiated as a single integrated document. I believe the Soviet strategy is to deal with each segment of the problem piece-meal, nailing down one piece after another, in a manner favorable to Soviet interests and using all effective measures—diplomatic, propaganda and through enhanced strategic capabilities—to bring pressure on the United States to achieve agreement. Among the issues they consider already settled are the inequalities provided by the Interim Agreement. Their current interest in a threshold nuclear test ban and an agreement to forego a second ABM site is consistent with such a strategy and with inhibiting a U.S. response to the imminent deployment of the Soviet Union's new and much more effective family of offensive strategic systems.

The question then is how the United States should respond to the above Soviet negotiating strategy. I believe it is not possible at this time to negotiate a permanent agreement to replace the Interim Agreement which would be balanced, contribute to maintaining crisis stability and lay a basis for reducing the strategic arms competition between them. Soviet officials have indicated the view that what they call "the correlation of forces," which in communist terminology includes the aggregate of forces bearing on the situation, including psychological, political, economic and military factors, is moving in their favor and that, even though we may today believe that their proposals are one-sided and inequitable, eventually realism

will bring us to accept at least the substance of them.

This leaves the United States with difficult choices. One possibility—a possibility which I favored—was that the President and Dr. Kissinger support at the Summit the position which the U.S. Delegation, under their direction, had put forward to date and attempt to secure from Chairman Brezhnev agreement on improved negotiating guidelines to both delegations which would facilitate further progress toward negotiating a balanced and mutually acceptable permanent agreement to replace the Interim Agreement.

A second possibility is to buy time by concurring in certain partial measures, the long term effect of which may play into the Soviet overall strategy by diminishing the prospect of timely achievement of the type of permanent agreement the United States has so far been advocating, but which are not clearly opposed to the United States' interest in avoiding strategic inferiority. Even under this alternative, it would seem to me to be essential that we use to advantage such time as we buy to prevent any significant U.S. strategic inferiority from occurring.

A third possibility is to resist partial agreements not clearly in the U.S. strategic interest while initiating as promptly as possible those measures which would assure an adequate U.S. strategic posture, even in the absence of a permanent agreement, and which would be most likely to enhance the prospect of being able to negotiate a balanced overall replacement agreement prior to the expiration of the Interim Agreement in 1977.

I would like further to briefly mention certain additional points pertinent to the current arms control debate.

I believe the significance of the impending increases in Soviet offensive capability are generally recognized. Not generally recognized, however, are the indications of Soviet strategic policies which can be gleaned from what members of the Soviet hierarchy say to each other in open Russian language articles and speeches. Ambassador Foy Kohler's recent monograph entitled "The Role of Nuclear Forces in the Current Soviet Strategy," bears on this question. It brings out the distinction between the western concept of deterrence and the Soviet concept of "peaceful co-existence" with its implication of a continuing struggle ending with "the complete and final victory of communism on a world scale." It further notes Soviet emphasis upon deterrence through a war winning capability, with its implications of military superiority, preemption and counterforce.

There is a tendency in certain American studies of arms control to look upon the action and reacting strategic relationship between the sides in a way which leans over backward in its objectivity. Albert Wohlstetter's recent analyses, however, demonstrates that, contrary to widely held views, the United States has for many years underestimated future Soviet offensive deployments, decreased its constant dollar expenditures on strategic forces, and decreased both the megatonnage and the equivalent megatonnage of its strategic nuclear arsenal. While doing so it has increased the number of its offensive warheads while greatly reducing their size, and while making an approximately equal reduction in the number of its strategic defensive warheads. The questions is, whether we can continue to follow such a course, in the face of the imminent Soviet increases in offensive capability, without danger to the security of the United States and its allies.

At the initial SALT session at Helsinki, the U.S. Delegation took the position that under all circumstances, under a SALT agreement or without such an agreement, the U.S. would maintain a deterrent posture such that

no nation could expect to gain from attacking either the United States or its allies.

I take it this continues to be the policy of the United States. The question remains—how much is enough? Some argue that the United States has overkill capabilities. Such statements generally refer to current inventories of weapons. They generally do not take into account survivability, reliability, assurance of penetration, and command and control over the relevant period. That period would appear to me to be about ten years. Under peace time conditions, it generally takes the United States such a time span from the initial decision to request authorization of a program by the Congress and effective deployment of the system in adequate volume to be strategically significant. I might note that this much time might not be necessary under alternate procedures. It took no more than thirty months from the time the decision was made to break ground for the necessary facilities to the first flight of the Boeing 747. Neither do those who argue that the United States has overkill capabilities take into account the political importance of retaining essential equivalence in fact and in appearance.

In conclusion, it is my view that nuclear war is best avoided by assuring that no potential aggressor sees grounds for optimism in engaging in a course of action which could potentially lead to nuclear war. This point is well supported by Geoffrey Blainey's study entitled "The Causes of War." Declaratory statements concerning the desirability of peace are politically useful and desirable, but do not, by themselves, necessarily contribute to the above assurance.

AMERICA'S VETERANS: HAVE WE FORGOTTEN?

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, our Vietnam veterans are, for the most part, young men who were either draftees or draft-motivated enlistees into our Armed Forces who entered the service at a time when they could normally have been starting productive private lives. What separated today's veterans from veterans of previous wars is both the nature of the war they fought and the atmosphere in which it was fought. These factors have combined to make some veterans feel that they are without honor in their own land, made pariahs by the very people who sent them to fight.

Many of these young men are gathering in Washington this week to make known the frustrations they have experienced since their return from Vietnam. In large part, these frustrations are not answerable here; Congress cannot be held responsible for all the negative experiences our youngest veterans experienced when they returned to their homes. However, Congress is not without fault in treatment of these young men. We had a hand in sending them to war; that hand has been conspicuously less active in caring adequately for their needs on their return.

So that we may have a bit of insight into the nature of the feelings of many of these veterans we will be meeting over the next few days. I wish to insert into

the RECORD part of a most perceptive article collected by my friend, retired Col. William Corson for Penthouse magazine. The article by Arthur Egendorf, Jr., deals with the reactions of many veterans to the America they came home to. I hope that each Member will take the time to read the message this article transmits, for to ignore it will be to compound the indignities that our veterans have already suffered:

THE UNSTRUNG HEROES
(By Arthur Egendorf, Jr.)

"I don't see how anyone can have funny dreams or sexy dreams. All my dreams now are scary as hell. Like we're on patrol and I'm on point. Sergeant had to go and put me up front again. And then I hit a trip wire and a mine tears me up. There's nothing left of me but little pieces. So someone shovels dirt into a body bag with my name on it just so it'll weigh something and people at home will think they've actually brought me back."

After other American wars, veterans came home as victors, full of tales of glory. They became a social force far more important than their numbers. Honored, respected, maybe even feared a little, they soon assumed leadership in American government and industry. But not after Vietnam. Wrong war. Wrong generation. Wrong ending. There are no heroes this time. In fact, today's veterans seem to be almost deliberately eliminating their power to act as a social force.

There are more than six million Vietnam-era veterans—men and women who served in the U.S. military between August 1964 and January 1973. Some three million of these served in Vietnam. Most of them came home—physically, at least. This article is about where they are now.

"My life wasn't so great before Vietnam. But I thought if I got some training and some medals I could come back and things would be better. Well they aren't. My family still doesn't want me, being a grunt doesn't mean anything to nobody, and I just can't hack it. So I take drugs. One time I hoped I'd O.D., only my sister found me in time and brought me to the hospital. Couldn't even do that right."

In 1970, a study found that the Vietnam veteran is in much worse shape than his World War II counterpart. "Suicidal or assaultive tendencies" are 50 percent higher, "drug usage" is almost 300 percent higher, and there are 30 percent more "suicidal acts."

A more recent study, of 1,000 vets who left Vietnam in September 1971, established that about 10 percent were on drugs when they left Vietnam. Of these drug users, 35 percent were still unemployed six months after their release from the military, and 34 percent were arrested within the same period. Of those who were married when they went to Vietnam, 38 percent were separated or divorced six months after coming home. (White House Special Action Office on Drug Abuse Prevention, April 1973.)

It would be comforting to imagine that these were "bad apples," incorrigibles. But this is not true. As the White House study cautions: "It would be a mistake to think of the Vietnam drug user as a highly deviant soldier with prior drug experience who could have been expected to get into trouble. Almost half (45 percent) of the men who used drugs in Vietnam were high school graduates who had no civilian arrests, no previous military discipline and no previous narcotics experience." In short, these men were the boys next door.

"Drugs were the only thing left to do. We all knew it was bull over there. We were fighting mostly kids young enough to be in junior high. I started smoking O.J.'s [opium joints] and when I got back I had a Jones [heroin addiction]. I was a junkie, man. Me!

Three-letter man and all, and I had to start taking people off [stealing] to keep my habit going."

The picture isn't that much brighter for the majority who were not "drug positive" on leaving Vietnam. Six months after coming back "only" 18 percent were unemployed and 21 percent had been arrested.

"I was barely out of school when the whole draft thing came up. I was looking for work, making contacts, when they called me. Well, you know, you come back, look up old contacts, and they don't know you anymore. One guy actually told me flat out, 'Even if I had an opening for you, I'd be crazy to hire a guy who's been through what you have and hasn't had time to dry out.' It was ten months before I got anything other than odd jobs. And that made about three years between when I first got my notice and when my first real job came along. I couldn't support my wife and she got fed up supporting me. We fought all the time after a while. Now I'm working, but I'm single again, too."

"So," you might say, "vets are into drugs, getting arrested, unemployed, getting divorced. So war is hell. What else is new? All war is hell. What is the matter with these veterans?"

Well, that's all true—except that Vietnam was unlike any other war America ever fought. Vietnam was the indiscriminate use of napalm; search-and-destroy missions, in which whole villages would be destroyed to "save" them from the Communists; free-fire zones—places in which anything that moved was a target; body counts—entire units competing with each other to kill more people.

Vietnam was all of this—but even more, Vietnam was the most controversial war in American history. The reasons for fighting were always changing and American fighting men were never sure who was supporting them and why. It became impossible to determine just who the enemy was . . . after a while, all "gooks" became the enemy. It was only after they returned home that the GI's could reflect on what they had seen and done.

Representatives of the Veterans Administration do not have a reputation for sticking their necks out, and their statements on issues are conservative positions. But in 1971 Cecil Peck, Chief of the V.A.'s Psychology Division, stated:

"The Vietnam veteran is unique in that he fought in a highly complex war . . . [with a background of] unprecedented social, educational, economic, political, and cultural changes . . . environmental and societal forces. . . . The Vietnam veteran is different from his other counterparts."

In an effort to explain the veterans' problems, some people use the term "Post-Vietnam Syndrome" (PVS). A syndrome is defined as a group or set of concurrent symptoms, and so PVS implies that all Vietnam vets have the same problems and show them pretty much the same way. That's not very likely—there are too many veterans for any one term to apply to all. Just how many has been hotly debated. But after years of claiming that troubled vets were only a small minority, the Veterans Administration has now stated:

"Reliable surveys and studies conducted by the military and by the VA indicate serious and prolonged readjustment problems exist in approximately one out of five new veterans but, to a lesser degree, were experienced by all."

"They think the big thing about Vietnam is that you could watch it on TV. The real miracle for me was the jet ride to hell and back. It's two years later and I still got jet lag."

As a quick handle, "readjustment problems" has "PVS" beat. But it still doesn't clarify much. Going back to the way they were before they left has not been a realistic option for most vets—so they're not re-

doing anything. As for the adjustment part, many vets say they wouldn't mind doing some bending here and there, if only they had some sign that society recognized their existence. On an unemployment line one day a freckle-faced ex-medic shouted, "I'm beginning to find out what it feels like to be a nigger."

It does seem often that veterans are a separate oppressed (and depressing) minority. Many vets feel that the only time they're in the papers is when someone with military experience hijacks a plane, robs a bank, or goes on a killing spree. But several minority groups have gained insights into their oppression, and emerged with a heightened consciousness, a sense of solidarity, which becomes a foundation for working toward change. Unfortunately, that hasn't happened among veterans.

There have been some laudable efforts—a national conference on the emotional needs of Vietnam-era veterans held in St. Louis in April 1973, the march on Washington and the demonstrations at the Republican Convention in 1972, and projects run by veterans to help other veterans—and these have already begun to make their mark (see the list with this article), but a veterans' movement has not yet arrived.

"The last organization I joined was the U.S. Army. I learned my lesson. I'll never join another one again."

What's the trouble? It's been more than ten years since the first vets came back from Vietnam. Why haven't any Vietnam vets been elected to Congress like so many World War II vets (Nixon, McGovern, Kennedy, Inouye, Cranston . . .) were in the 1940's and early '50's?

Part of the answer is that veterans feel that "people don't want to know"—and effective political organization is inhibited.

Some vets have been coming to informal rap sessions. In New York City, for example, more than two hundred vets have come at one time or another since the sessions began in December 1970. That's a small number, especially in New York. But these groups are not an isolated phenomenon. Dr. Chaim Shatan, the psychiatrist who originally arranged for volunteer psychotherapists to take part in sessions, says that he has had contact with more than forty similar groups all over the country.

Those who have come, particularly in the past two years, have nothing terribly wrong with them. These are not the paraplegics, the quadriplegics, the blind, or any of the other thousands of "totally disabled" Vietnam vets, whose anguish is readily understood by the average citizen. They show no obvious symptoms, nothing that would draw attention as they walk down the street; they don't conform to the stereotypes of the "mentally ill." But they're uneasy, anxious, and continually depressed. There are problems of impotence, difficulties finding or holding jobs, fears of one's own rage—a general dissatisfaction with life.

"For a long time I thought it was just me, that I'm crazy and I have to get used to it. But then I discovered that all the vets I know are feeling the same thing. Nothing's going the way we want for any of us. Maybe it's not just me—it's us."

One vet read about the rap groups in a newspaper and came in trembling. He had been back from Vietnam for five years but had not told anyone, not even his wife, about the most upsetting experience of his life. He said he dreams about it at least once a week, and sometimes he is bothered so much that he's afraid to fall asleep.

On one of his last patrols in Vietnam he saw his friend ahead of him fall forward. He went to help. Moving quickly to avoid getting shot, he rolled his friend over and lifted him on his shoulder, noticing, but not really registering, that there was little left of his friend's head. After crawling and running

some two hundred yards, he set his friend down and stared at the bloody mass, trying to make out the once familiar facial features. In the dream he and his friend keep changing positions, and he sees himself with a red blob instead of a face.

HIDEOUS deaths are part of all wars, and every generation of veterans comes home from nightmares. But beyond those well-defined traumas, there's something else that veterans have brought home from Vietnam. Most experience it as a general sense that something isn't quite right. Some veterans will trace their uneasiness directly to the war—that it wasn't what was cracked up to be, that they risked their lives for nothing. There are often self-doubts, too: "Was I sufficiently brave? Did I really prove myself a man?" These lead to troubling questions about whether bravery or "manhood" makes any sense.

Many ask, "What does it mean?" or, "Why was I there?" Others easily articulate political explanations for the war. But the implied self-criticism, "If it was wrong, why didn't I refuse to go?" is unanswered. Whether or not that question is raised, virtually all vets who come to the groups share the feeling that the war wasn't real; that the year or two in Vietnam didn't happen. One man once joked that it felt like a hole in the soul, only to have several other vets snatch the phrase up and exclaim that it fits precisely their sense of it, too.

"I've thought about this many times: I am in a country that has been involved in a war for more than ten years but shows no outward signs of it. The hole inside me appears as a reflection of the absence around me of anything to confirm what I lived through."

When veterans first joined the rap groups, they are anxious to explore their experiences in Vietnam. But their questions about the past are never isolated from their concerns in the present. They ask themselves, "Why am I here in this group? Is it because of what I went through in Vietnam or because of what I'm going through now?" The frustrating conclusion is that there's no way to distinguish between the two, even though the "present difficulties" they most often discuss are relationships with wives and girlfriends, and these problems don't seem to have anything to do with war. But the metaphor of a soul with a hole makes sense here: love is difficult when you feel incomplete.

From the earliest meetings of the rap groups, some of the volunteer therapists noticed a distinctive quality in the veterans' struggles, something they have called numbed feelings: reactions to, or protections against, trauma. Dr. Shatan traces this sort of problem back to Basic Training, which teaches Spartan virtues and actively discourages tenderness and empathy.

A former Basic Training drill instructor (who had also been to Vietnam) came to one meeting and said, "Ever since I got out of the Crotch [Marine Corps] I get these spells . . . every six weeks or so I feel like I start looking for fights. It almost scares me, except that I don't feel anything, because I'm not afraid of anything. Nothing hurts . . . I don't care about anything, except, sort of, my daughter. Maybe that's why I don't beat up my wife too bad; she takes care of the girl."

Sometimes a veteran's numbness seems closely related to his encounters with death, a kind of psychological protection from the guilt of the survivor—"Why did he die and not me? And how could I be so shameful as to be glad that I was able to buy life for myself through another man's death?" Many veterans share these feelings.

"I don't think I love my wife. I don't know. Actually I don't know anything, even whether I should still be alive. It's the same now as it was in Nam. . . . I volunteered to walk point [the riskiest position at the head of a patrol] for two hundred days straight,

beginning right after the day I froze in combat. . . . I thought then and I still think now that I don't deserve to live. . . . You see, I could have saved this one guy who was covering me that day, if only I hadn't been scared to leave my own foxhole."

Outside the rap groups or other settings, such as hospitals or drug-treatment centers, where veterans readily acknowledge the importance of a psychological dimension, veterans display a great deal of reticence, and sometimes even deny that anything is wrong at all. As one vet put it: "There's nothing the matter with me or any of the vets I know. All those shrinks talking 'bout problems are a bunch of candy asses; they're the ones with problems!"

There are several reasons for this. First, as Tony Jones noted in *Harpers* (August 1972), it is only after many hours spent talking with veterans that "you become aware that they carry two sets of pictures with them. . . . One set [is] for public consumption . . . composed of answers meant to turn away further questions, or at the very least confine them to a predictable course. . . . Only gradually, with trust, does the second set of views emerge . . . far less ordered, contradictory . . . [with] . . . elements of pain, anger and despair, and they arise from some deep inner space accompanied by a sense of great vulnerability."

Secondly, veterans who sense their own confusion are naturally wary of intrusive questioning. One frequent response is, "I'm tired of people asking me, 'Vietnam? Did you kill anybody? How'd it feel?'" Another is, "Why don't they stop talking about veterans and just leave me alone?"

Thirdly, vets are survivors of an uncommon ordeal. War, no matter how painful, can teach unique lessons. Every vet comes back with a sense that he has seen and overcome something that most other people haven't. So, to many vets, talk about psychological problems often seems like a veiled attempt to belittle their trials and to deny their satisfaction at having survived.

Fourthly, most psychological investigators have an air of superiority: they pry, make judgments, and hint about cures—like magicians. Many veterans who went to Vietnam believing they would be doing something worthwhile lost their faith in the old magic. Any language that's removed from their experience—like the jargon of psychology—makes no sense to them.

"One is definitely schizophrenic when the regression of one's security operations, enforced by parataxic interpersonal relations, actually menaces one's survival. . . . It comes about, therefore, that the schizophrenic person, even though he is aware—in the disowned, 'they' fashion—of tendencies which manifestly involve him in rather durable integrations incongruous with his past experience and foreign to his at least dimly formulated career-line, cannot easily reintegrate a unitary awareness."—H. S. Sullivan, *Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry*.

Applying such jargon to veterans can incite them to rage. This reaction is particularly common among black and other minority veterans. Although blacks made up only 11 percent of the total military force, they accounted for 18 percent of the combat deaths in Vietnam.

One of the brothers put it to me this way. "Emotional problems? yeah. I've got emotional problems. I can't get a decent job because I don't have enough school, I can't get more school because the GI Bill doesn't pay enough for me to quit work. And I can't do both without getting more emotional problems. And I fought for this?"

A third-generation Japanese recalls: "The first day in Basic Training, the DI [drill instructor] yelled at us, 'Here we're gonna teach ya how to kill gooks. And if ya don't know what a gook looks like, there's one standing over there.' He was pointing at me."

"The first time I refused an order, my commanding officer said I had no guts. The second time, he sent me to the shrink, who said, 'Tell me, exactly in your own words, what seems to be the trouble.' I told him I refuse to burn any more houses down while the people are still in them. So the bastard says, 'Is there something you're not telling me? Something you're afraid of?'"

During the early years of the Vietnam War, Veterans Administration and Pentagon spokesmen denied the possibility that there would be any widespread psychological reactions among veterans. So it took some courage for one team of VA psychiatrists to look more deeply into these early claims of a "record low combat psychiatric casualty rate" and to raise, in 1970, "the question of whether this low casualty rate is not at least partially spurious, resulting from lack of recognition or adequate treatment of significant psychiatric illness that, representing unresolved conflict, re-manifests itself later."

By late 1970 and early 1971 raising that question took progressively less courage. In the years 1964-1968, the combat psychiatric casualty rate had been no higher than that for troops stationed in the United States. By 1969-1970, however, despite the claims that the war was "winding down," the rate of psychiatric evacuations doubled. In addition, one in every five Army enlisted men in Vietnam was experimenting with heroin and two out of three regularly prescribed for themselves a fine grade of the local cannabis weed to "help keep the head on straight."

The military obviously didn't expect this deluge of drug-taking, abrupt increases of psychiatric casualties, and the massive post-war difficulties among Vietnam veterans. And the explanations offered by military doctors never made much sense to the men involved.

Psychiatrists and psychologists in government agencies don't like to be controversial. So they stick to notions like "stress." Used as a technical term, stress is a set of specific bodily reactions. You can study it by measuring the level of hormone secretion (often in the urine, which is how this research got the name "piss research"), and you don't have to get involved with complex psychological, political, or moral issues.

But the situation is not totally bleak. There are signs that even the Veterans Administration has begun to learn something about vets. In December 1970, the VA established a Vietnam-Era Veteran Committee, headed by Charles Stenger, a psychologist. Stenger is a World War II veteran and ex-POW. His toughest battles, however, have probably been his conferences with young veterans all over the country.

Stenger has become sensitive to the far-reaching, complex, and sometimes mutually antagonistic sensibilities of the veteran population.

Despite people like Stenger, there are many more men who need assistance than there are resources available. One obvious proposal would be to expand the currently limited psychological facilities of the Veterans Administration. For example, a veteran has to prove "service connection" ("Doctor, the war did it to me!") for whatever he feels is wrong if he wants outpatient treatment, and he has to prove it within a year after leaving the military. Otherwise the VA says, "Sorry about that." Senator George McGovern proposed a bill to improve these services that passed the Senate in the spring of 1973. As of this writing (December 1973) the bill still sits in committee. Its passage is long overdue.

The kind of healing veterans need most, however, has to take place outside of treatment rooms. Doctor's medicines can't fill a hole in the soul.

In part, vets suffer because they're the only inheritors of the massive catastrophe called Vietnam. Nobody else will claim responsibility. There is a moral void, a responsibility vacuum. So the vets take the rap—not only

because others see it that way ("Gee son, it must have been tough over there," or, "How come you fellows didn't win your war? We won ours."), but also because vets can't forget the place and time in which they risked death. Others, maybe you who read this, didn't risk that much. Perhaps you're worried about the environment, the energy crisis, what courses to take in night school . . . but Vietnam? Veterans? Isn't that all over now?

"My kid's three now. I guess in another year or two he'll be playing with guns, like they all do. Another year after that and it'll be war games. Then he'll be asking me, 'Daddy, you're a veteran, what did you do in the war?' And maybe, 'Daddy, what happened in Vietnam, did we win?' That's all easy, I think. But when he starts to wonder why, and to ask whose fault it is, then I'm stumped. A son wants his father to matter. Did I matter? Was I what went wrong? If I got out of that one, then I didn't matter. Who did matter?"

"When I came back from Vietnam, I felt so horrible about what I had seen, so guilty that I hadn't rebelled against it, that I imagined every veteran must feel the same way. How could any of us avoid recognizing in Vietnam that we were the treacherous enemy of the Vietnamese people. How could we fail to see through our government lies?"

Long talks with hundreds of veterans over the last three years have shown that these questions aren't always asked. Lots of vets don't feel guilty about what they saw, what they did, the war in general.

This is not to say they don't hurt. Their pain is one of betrayal—betrayal by a historical era that left them with no viable rationale for "their" war, their initiation into manhood. Any proud claims about the battlefields of Vietnam evoke no response—they are heard as pathetic self-deception, the sham that soldiers console themselves with when they come home losers, the transparent disguises of heartless executioners.

History has cheated the Vietnam veteran. "His" was the wrong war, fought in the wrong time, the wrong place, the wrong way. He can answer, "But I did my duty. I followed my orders." But he will be cheated again. For when the question is asked, "Whose orders? Who told you to shoot unarmed civilians on the suspicion that they might have been dangerous?" Nobody answers for him. Has Johnson, Nixon, Westmoreland, Abrams, Laird, or any of the others stepped forward to take the rap? When, for instance, Calley was found guilty, all his superiors on the chain of command—the men who were responsible for him—claimed total innocence and the law supported their claim.

The guiltless veterans either waves the flag, and is left to wave it alone, or he tries to pass the buck, which nobody will take. As Robert Jay Lifton pointed out in his definitive study, *Home from the War*, the veteran is either the executioner or the victim—the hired gun or the sucker. In either case he is betrayed.

Some veterans don't like that choice, feeling that neither role leaves them much room to maneuver. But if they stop trying to say, "Everything I did was cool," or, "I had no choices, they made me do it," they have to start asking some hard questions: "Why did I do it? Did I really not know what was happening? Weren't other choices available, but I just chose to ignore them? Sure, I didn't start it, but why did I go along?"

"Change isn't a big enough word to describe what happens when you switch from fighting a war to condemning it and assuming your share of responsibility for it. It's usually quite messy: Friends think you've gone crazy ('Why does he have to go around yelling about genocide all the time?'), relatives think you've retreated into a second adolescence ('What do you mean saying we

live off blood money just because you think the war is wrong?'), carefully laid plans for a respectable career go up in smoke."

Some vets say that coming home was fairly smooth. But when you get to know them better, you find that it was only easy on the surface—they have either poured their anguish into a book or two, a long diary, or a strong, understanding woman who stood by as confessor-shrink, giving her man a chance to heal. They end up feeling the guilt; they're just quieter about it.

Old ways of thinking collapse. Once you've been dead wrong, it's hard to be perfectly certain again; once you conclude that the cause you could have died for was phony, it's hard to trust other people's causes again.

But the guilt can serve a purpose. It can cleanse and, through the washing of the old, you can attempt to build something new. Some of the vets who have done this feel that they have something now they never knew before—a new dimension inside, a strange sort of hope, possibly a new maturity, and a hint that, however awful life may be, it's not worthless.

"I never used to cry so much before. I can just look at a picture now, a beautiful picture, and I feel the goosebumps. Kids make me laugh, the sun makes me smile. I notice all this stuff I never knew about before. If war crimes are a huge mistake, maybe I can derive some large lessons from mine. If my life was bought with the deaths of thousands of Vietnamese and GI's who died in my place, maybe I can redeem myself by not perpetuating the lies that led to their dying. If I closed my eyes to all the warning signs of evil before I went, fearing the inconveniences of facing the truth, maybe I can change now, and arrange my life so that the truth doesn't inconvenience me quite so much."

This new dimension, this strange hope, is tentative and cautious. No one gets off easy. And, although few vets who understand their guilt would want to switch places with those who are ignorant of it, everyone is in the same basic situation—surrounded by America's responsibility vacuum.

But once one begins to acknowledge guilt in an age of abdication, it's hard to know when to stop—a lot went wrong, a lot to account for, but there's not much help to be had in shouldering the burden. Trying to figure out how much to leave to others is confusing and hard. Some vets end up feeling like martyrs—overloaded, wearing their pain like a badge of holiness: "Look how much I suffer, look how much I pay for my sins." Sometimes it's too, too much, and instead of trying to pass the buck, they shove it in other people's faces. "It's your war too!" Like doomsday prophets, they stand in judgment—only vaguely remembering that once others were judging them.

Transformed? Yes. Ennobled in some people's eyes ("Isn't he courageous to face up to so much?")? Yes. But switching off between martyrdom and prophecy is terribly lonely. And veterans who accept their guilt end up just as estranged from society as their brothers who are outcast as executioners and victims. "Normal" people can't relate to a saint anymore than to a devil.

So veterans still haven't fully come home. Concern about "PVS" is the first sign that people know they're back, but it's hard not to ask if that concern doesn't hide the non-veteran's reactions more than it shows his empathy for veterans. It's still easier for vets to talk among themselves, despite their differences, than to open up with most non-vets. While the dialogue between vets and those who didn't go may never be perfect, and while vets may have to sacrifice claims to saintliness as well as to heroic prowess for it to get much better, vets feel as if the doors are locked for reasons that have to do not with them alone, but with all those whose silence is part of America's responsibility vacuum.

PATRIOTISM—SELF INSTILLED

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, during Flag Day weekend last month, I urged our fellow Americans to consider flying the 13-star flag periodically in preparation for a bicentennial celebration in 1976. The idea was well received and I was pleased to learn later that it was being pursued long before my proposal by students at National City Junior High School. Since April 15, these students have been making exact replicas of the 13-star flag and proudly presented one as a surprise to their principal, Mr. William E. Darton, who initiated this unique project, which he explained to me in the following report. I include this in the RECORD as a portion of my remarks:

PATRIOTISM—SELF INSTILLED

The idea for this project has been with me for some time. I originally voiced it to Assemblyman Waddie Deddeh on December 2, 1970. At that time I was Boys' Vice-Principal at Hilltop High School and I had numerous opportunities to note the apathy of the students during morning patriotic exercises. The perfunctory manner in which they saluted the flag appalled me.

The immediate thought was to force students to stand and salute properly. However, the thought was quickly dismissed as force would do nothing to create what I felt should be proper respect for the flag and love of our country. This can only come from within and willingly.

I proposed to Mr. Deddeh that schools should be furnished with replicas of actual flags that had flown over our country, commencing with the 13 star flag. Students would then research historical incidents, political, humorous, etc. that had occurred while a particular flag flew over our nation. I flew to Sacramento at my own expense to present my idea to the Assembly Education Committee. It was not accepted and I left promising myself I would pursue the thought and at the first opportunity do something about it.

My opportunity arrived when I was appointed principal at National City Junior High. I used my basic premise and proposed "Patriotism—Self Instilled" in the autumn of 1973 to my school district. It was accepted at the county and I immediately began to work on it.

To my surprise, homemaking teachers were reluctant to attempt the project. Reasons offered were students were not skilled enough; teachers would wind up doing the work; regular curriculum would suffer and other reasons. I made a personal appeal to sewing classes and got a response from eight girls. I then recruited a teacher, Miss Karen Laffoon, and my wife as resource people. The girls agreed to work one hour after school each Tuesday and Thursday. Actually their enthusiasm extended beyond this time determinant many times.

Obtaining flag bunting proved to be difficult. It was finally located at Academy Flags in La Mesa. The owner was quite helpful and interested in the project. He obtained the bunting from a firm in Valley Forge, Pennsylvania.

The pupils in Mr. Ridgeway's math class calculated the amount of material we would need for eight flags. While we were awaiting the shipment, the social science classes were busy researching historical incidents related to the flags. These incidents will be utilized at a later date.

In addition to the research going on, a

rather simple test was administered to four social science classes (copy attached) in order to make some kind of determination as to the existing knowledge on the part of the students. Unfortunately, we were unable to make a post test this school year as the program was not complete. However, these same students will be here next year and the test will be given.

The girls actually began work on the flags April 15 (due to difficulty in obtaining flag bunting) and completed the last flag June 11th. They devoted many unselfish hours as did Miss Laffoon.

A great deal of interest was aroused and there were many positive side effects. The National City Star News gave us publicity as did the San Diego Union. I was invited to a D.A.R. luncheon which I attended and displayed two of the flags made by the girls. By chance Assemblyman Waddie Deddeh had been invited and he, of course, was quite pleased that the project had not died.

The culmination of this project will be the flying of these flags during the school year commencing September 1974 at which time use will be made of the historical research.

I sincerely hope the program has changed and will change the indifferent attitude of those students who presently seem unaware of what our flag represents. I do know that it has been inspirational to many already and it has been most worthwhile to me. I deeply appreciate the support of the County Department of Education and my school district, the Sweetwater Union High School District, in this endeavor.

SOVIET RESETTLEMENT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a time when officials of the Soviet Union are waging antipropaganda in opposition to trade that will benefit the economy, I believe that it is especially important that we recognize the persecution that prevails in the Soviet Empire. An article that I recently read in the June 21 edition of the Christian Science Monitor reflects the unjust and forced resettlement of the Lithuanian farmers. We must keep in mind that the Lithuanians are also subject to the "Russification" pressures that are imposed on the people of the U.S.S.R. The Lithuanians are not only subject to political persecution under Communist rule, but they are also forced to accept nationalistic persecution.

The article follows:

SOVIET RESETTLEMENT—100,000 LITHUANIAN FARMERS FACE FORCED MOVE TO VILLAGES TO FREE ADDITIONAL ACREAGE

(By Leo Grullow)

Moscow.—Approximately 100,000 Lithuanian farm families are to be moved from their ancestral farm cottages to central farm settlements to that the fields where their houses stand may be planted.

Plans to compensate the farmers for loss of their homes and to grant them loans for building new houses in the central settlements were announced in a decree issued by the Lithuanian Council of Ministers.

The decree, reported in Lithuanian newspapers, was declared to have the approval of the central Soviet government in Moscow. In Russia proper, where the feudalism

lasted into the 19th century, rural dwellers always lived in villages, with houses clustered around a manor house and strung along one or several lanes, though the farm fields lay far away.

Collectivization made no change in this housing pattern, except that the manor house usually became the farm center or club.

In the Baltic regions the farmer's cottage—lay in the center of his fields and at a distance from neighbors. Although the fields have been collectivized, farmers continue to reside in their separate family cottages.

Such farm houses had previously been condemned and their occupants moved when the land around them was scheduled for drainage and improvement. Now all isolated farm cottages will be subject to condemnation, whether the land on which they stand is to be drained or not.

Most of the cottages to be torn down are in the southern and eastern parts of Lithuania, where drainage and land improvement are not needed and hence such cottages had hitherto been left untouched.

Commissions will appraise the cottages and their private gardens to establish the compensation due. Upon moving the state or collective farm central settlements, the farmers are granted 15-year home-building loans up to 3,500 rubles (about \$4,250). The state or collective farms are to pay 35 percent of the loan. The new homes may be either privately purchased or co-ops.

The decree set no time period or schedule for the vast program to move farmers into central settlements. It simply announced the provisions for compensation and loans and the procedures to be employed. The resettlement undoubtedly will be spread over many years.

Lithuania, one of the most prosperous regions in the Soviet Union, is strongly Roman Catholic and its people are noted for their independent spirit.

For several years, the far southern Soviet Republic of Moldavia—another region where farmsteads used to be isolated from one another—has been moving rural families from their dispersed cottages into centralized farm settlements.

The resettlement there has been linked with a program to merge farms into larger units under combined corporate management.

Under this system, groups of large specialized farms, both state and collective, are integrated with packing and processing plants into regional corporations. Some of these large units have been building "agro-cities" to house the farmers.

The Moldavia corporate farming plan is being extended experimentally to other parts of the Soviet Union, including some places in the Baltic region.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the results of my annual questionnaire taken this past April in the 18th district indicate an overwhelming desire for Washington to stop ignoring the people and get going on solving the Nation's problems.

I have been surprised at the near unanimity on the issues, with the exception of campaign financing.

The statistical data contained in the nearly 30,000 responses, listed the following specifics:

Approve my stand in favor of an excess profits tax on the oil industry: Approve 79 percent, against 8 percent, unsure 13 percent.

Favor my opposition to gutting clean air laws because of the "energy crisis": Favor 80 percent, oppose 5 percent, unsure 15 percent.

Like idea of using other tax revenues to lower employees' social security payroll tax: Yes 71 percent, no 14 percent, unsure 15 percent.

Approve my call for stronger Government antitrust action to enforce competition: Yes 83 percent, no 2 percent, unsure 15 percent.

Reaction to public financing of congressional races: Strongly favor 27 percent, mixed feelings 35 percent, strongly oppose 24 percent, unsure 14 percent.

Agree on need for national health program to protect against catastrophic medical problems: Strongly agree 54 percent, somewhat agree 25 percent, do not agree 7 percent, unsure 14 percent.

Favor my efforts to give higher priority to railroads and mass transit and lower priority to interstate highways: Favor 72 percent, oppose 6 percent, unsure 22 percent.

Feel Government statistics on increase of food prices are: Much too low 36 percent, too low 39 percent, about right 23 percent, unsure 2 percent.

Federal spending priorities indicated by his constituents: Higher for education, social security, health, mass transit, and sewage treatment; lower for military spending, welfare/aid to poor, and foreign aid; about same for manpower training, public works, housing, and revenue sharing.

Rating of my congressional office service to constituents: Excellent 16 percent, satisfactory 18 percent, unsatisfactory 3 percent, no contact or not responding 63 percent.

The comments following my impeachment question discussion fell into these general categories: For impeachment 29 percent, against impeachment 28 percent, use personal judgment 30 percent, for resignation 5 percent, no response 8 percent.

I am impressed because the results of the questionnaire show that people are speaking out strongly about the need for a more responsive Government.

DOT BACKS STANDARD TIME

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, when year-round daylight saving time was proposed as a potential energy saving measure, I opposed the legislation because there appeared to be no concrete evidence that this would provide meaningful conservation of our valuable energy resources. Further, I pointed out the danger that this would cause for young schoolchildren waiting on dark mountain roads for their buses each morning. I submit that daylight saving time has resulted in

more harm and inconvenience than proving to be the magic energy saver its advocates assured us it would be.

I include for the RECORD an article from the July 2, 1974, Washington Post reporting that the Department of Transportation has recommended that our Nation return to standard time. I support this move, and I recommend it to the attention of my colleagues. Let us put an end to attempts to legislate controls on the light from the Sun.

The article follows:

DOT BACKS STANDARD TIME
(By Peter Milius)

The Department of Transportation has recommended that the country go back on standard time this November through next February.

Late last year, Congress put the country on year-round daylight savings time in a two-year experiment aimed at saving energy.

The experiment is scheduled to run through October 1975 but opponents have been urging that it be cut short.

Their claim is that the year-round daylight time has not saved much if any energy, has seriously inconvenienced many people in many ways, and has endangered school children by requiring them to go to school in the dark on winter mornings.

Transportation Secretary Claude S. Brinegar said his department's study "indicated the energy savings was very small; a spokesman put it at 0.75 to one per cent of what consumption would be otherwise.

Brinegar also said there was "some evidence" that daylight time had been hazardous to school children in the November-February period, which would go back to standard time under DOT's proposal.

A spokesman said, however, the department found there actually were fewer children killed in traffic accidents this January and February than in past years. More were killed in early-morning accidents, but fewer later in the day, the spokesman said.

Congress must act on the department's suggestion for it to become law.

Brinegar said the recommendation was for this winter only—more experimentation. The government would then decide later what to do about daylight time in the longer run, he said.

PRIVATE PHILANTHROPY AND NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE— IMPACT ON HOSPITALS AND MEDICAL SCHOOLS

HON. WILLIAM R. ROY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ROY. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, I was pleased to speak before the national conference held by the National Association for Hospital Development entitled "Private Philanthropy and National Health Insurance: Impact on Hospitals."

Dr. David Pomrinse, director of the Mt. Sinai Hospital, gave an excellent talk on the historical role of private philanthropy in the health care system, calling it the "venture capital of American medicine." Because the role of philanthropy is so vital, and because it should be present in any NHI system, I insert the text of the talk in the RECORD, so the Members may have the opportunity to study it:

REMARKS BY S. DAVID POMRINSE, M.D.

This is a most welcome opportunity for me to discuss a favorite topic, the role of phi-

lanthropy under a national health insurance scheme. I must admit, however, that I received a bit of a jolt when I discovered that I was to be the only provider on the panel. This gives me the awesome responsibility of representing America's voluntary hospital system in a discussion which numbers among its participants so many experienced legislative health care planners.

I have no hesitation about carrying out this responsibility, but I trust that you will recognize that I speak from a particular point of view; that of a major university teaching hospital in an urban setting which, like all tertiary medical care centers, is seized with a multitude of responsibilities for patient care, education and research.

I would expect that many members of NAHD come from similar regional medical centers, for these are great institutions, precisely because they attract philanthropic support. Indeed, philanthropic investment, in great measure, founded many of them.

The prodigious advances made in American medicine are to a great extent the result of an historic symbiotic relationship between philanthropy and medical science. Philanthropy created the institutions and supported their growth. And, as these teaching hospitals grew, they attracted better and brighter physicians and research scientists. Thus, significant contributions to the future of American medicine were being made even as essential care was being provided for patients with the kind of complicated illnesses that required the most sophisticated and super-specialized services.

It must be emphasized that these are not just teaching or research centers. They do not exist in a vacuum. They are treatment centers, regional medical centers, if you will that must care for the most difficult cases which are referred to them from a network of community or secondary care hospitals throughout their respective regions.

The interplay between philanthropy and medical science's advance and the delivery of super-specialized care is one of the healthiest and most natural relationships to be found in American society. The scientist attracts support for his research. The specialized physician is given the capacity to deliver the sort of intensive care needed by relatively few people at any moment. And, the donor receives the advantage of being able to give his money where he knows it will do the most good.

In a sense the Philanthropic dollar is the venture capital of American medicine. Somebody has to be able to risk mistakes,—a position which government officials are not likely to accept. Our occasional mistakes are proof that we continue to try new and venturesome things. Without this sort of intelligent conscious risk taking, American medicine will stagnate and eventually decline. Particularly under a national health insurance scheme, this environment must be maintained and this is the role of voluntary philanthropy.

There are so many success stories which prove the extraordinary value of this venture capital. In my own hospital, only in recent weeks, we have opened a cancer center with considerable support from the National Cancer Institute. In my view this would never have come about had we not been able to mobilize a bit less than a half million dollars in philanthropic funds for seed money. In institutions such as ours, this generally means the wherewithal for attracting the necessary physician scientists for such endeavors.

Similarly, a relatively modest grant from one foundation in support of the concept of the employment of nurse practitioners enabled us to create a satellite clinic deep in the heart of the inner city. This particular facility, located about a mile and a half from the hospital proper, is not only providing routine and acute care for thousands of infants and young babies but, linked to us by

closed circuit television, it has the advantage of almost immediate consultation with a battery of highly skilled physicians in a wide range of medical specialties.

In a secondary way, the strength of the voluntary system is infused in the government hospitals. The largest Federal health system in the country, The Veterans Administration, and the largest non-Federal system, the New York City Health and Hospitals Corporation are both in large part dependent upon the voluntary teaching hospitals and medical schools for their professional support, the recruitment of physicians and essential medical leadership. These government hospitals have discovered that they simply are not able to attract quality physicians whom they desperately need without being closely affiliated with the teaching institutions of this country. We should learn from this experience and not permit ideology to get in the way of practicality.

America can build a stronger national system but it must pay special attention to the growing edge of medical care and to stimulate it rather than seek means of suppressing it. Short-sighted tax reformers have introduced legislation in the Congress to remove the tax advantages now realized by donors to institutions such as regional medical centers. With their eyes focused on loopholes, they fail to see the inevitable results of such a move. Not only would it destroy valuable philanthropy, but it would necessitate greater investment by government in these same facilities. The government is getting a bargain today. Reductions in tax payments are minimal compared to the additional tax funds that would be required to fill the gaps left by a shrinkage of philanthropy. The only alternative would be to halt all new developments and put a stop to new construction.

I don't mean to suggest that our institutions should be exempt from certificate-of-need legislation or from review by appropriate health planning agencies as to whether or not each proposed new service or building is in the public interest; far from it. New York State has been the vanguard of certificate-of-need legislation and has had what is probably the most effective program in the country for over a decade. We have not suffered from this. We have been able to introduce new expanded programs and to build many new structures. In each case, however, it came with the approval of the State Health Department and local planning agencies, which is as it should be.

The nation's voluntary community hospitals, the secondary care institutions, are also dependent upon philanthropy albeit in a somewhat different sense. They, too, need contributions, usually in smaller amounts and usually for construction and equipment and to help them meet their community responsibilities—that is, patient care for those unable to pay for themselves. And it should be noted that even under a national health scheme there are bound to be some patients for whom full payment will not be available. Somehow the hospital will have to find the dollars to enable them to take care of these people.

But there is a different form of contribution which I believe is particularly critical in community hospitals and that is the contribution by individuals of their time and their efforts. It is a delight to walk into a community hospital and see a large staff of volunteers and auxiliaries freely serving their fellows. I can think of no more appropriate and typically American way of maintaining local services than to see active, healthy, vigorous volunteers busily operating coffee shops, manning reception desks and patient libraries and visiting patients. These volunteers also provide an invaluable service by reporting to the management and leadership of those hospitals the needs of the communities from which they come.

To destroy this form of community participation, most particularly this contribu-

tion of self and of substance, would be the most regressive step that could be taken. Voluntary hospitals were established in response to local needs, by local community leaders supported in the main by community fund drives. I would urge that any national health insurance scheme recognize the essential nature of this kind of community support and rather than reduce the stimulus to philanthropy, find incentives to insure its continuation and growth. This is one way to be certain that the nation's community hospitals do not degenerate into stultified, lifeless and bureaucratic extensions of government.

I hope I do not sound too harsh in my descriptions of government involvement. For to tell the truth I have worked and will continue to work with many colleagues in government service and I have the utmost confidence in their skill, as well as respect for their ability and certainly their sincerity. But, just as I said earlier that there must be room for the risk of making errors, I am equally convinced that this is not the function of the public domain. It is vitally important therefore, for non-governmental hospitals to be sufficiently active, vigorous and healthy and to be able to assume that responsibility.

It's largely a matter of size and the lack of flexibility. If the government makes a mistake, it's likely to be on a very, very large scale. Further, it is likely to replicate its errors for many years before its philosophy changes. For instance, a poorly conceived governmental program may result from the eagerness of a legislator, most likely one seeking reelection. Once begun, it would be almost impossible to stop it before enormous amounts of money are poured into it.

To cite one example of how this can work, Sweden, relatively small country, embarked upon a hospital building program. We estimate that two or possibly three large hospitals would have been sufficient to serve its population. But the Swedes now have several very large hospitals which they are incapable of utilizing at any reasonable level.

It is not my intention to harp on the experiences of foreign countries too much, we have problems of our own, but in England, Sweden and Canada where they have three different types of governmental operational controls, the inflation rate is greater than our own. And, yet in America, we are dealing with a complicated, supposedly inefficient system which combines private, voluntary and public payment and regulatory schemes.

The ability of the voluntary hospitals to demonstrate how to do some things better and to provide alternatives to potential bureaucratic inertia makes it essential that the viability of these hospitals be supported, in part at least, by philanthropy.

In the current scheme of things philanthropy represents only a small part of the total hospital budget, but it is a very significant leverage factor. The economists tell us that the most significant dollar is the dollar at the margin, that being the next additional dollar or the next reduced dollar. This is the one that makes the change. More than 50% of the base budget of most voluntary hospitals comes from Medicare and Medicaid. It is the marginal dollar which can create new developments and this is where philanthropy is absolutely vital.

In my own hospital, philanthropic contributions represent a shade over 1% of our operational budget, but they do make up over 50% of the annual operating deficit. Without these philanthropic dollars we would not be able to function.

Time obviously will not permit an exhaustive analysis of all the key factors in a national health insurance scheme, but I would like to turn to a consideration of some of the important issues. First, coverage must be universal if it is to be meaningful. Otherwise those who need medical attention the most and who now have the least coverage,

will continue to be excluded from care. This country should not continue to compound the problems of those unable to earn an adequate living and who are suffering the miseries of untreated illness. We care for the very poor who are on Public Assistance but neglect those who are trying to avoid welfare, but are not able to sustain themselves fully. The working poor deserve coverage particularly because they're trying to make it in our society, if for no other reason.

Should there be a single source of funds or should there be multiple sources? As an administrator I like the simplicity of a single payment mechanism. It reduces paperwork, it saves administrative costs and it gives us the assurance that all appropriate costs will be funded. However, it reduces the flexibility which is possible when there are more than one source of dollars, which, in turn, would be an opportunity for rigid bureaucratic control of voluntary hospitals and thus has a tendency to destroy the very essence of the voluntary hospital. A compromise might well be that each of the payment programs must be committed to paying its full share of the hospital's appropriately incurred costs.

One of the key problems in New York today is that some 80% of the hospital's income derives from Medicaid, Medicare and Blue Cross. The administrator of each of these programs seems to measure his efficiency by his ability to reduce his own contribution to the total hospital pot.

For example, last year Medicare required the use of a new formula for calculating reimbursement known by the formidable acronym, departmental ROCAF. By this method it effectively reduced hospital income from that source by about 3%. Blue Cross and Medicaid which pay us by an average cost per diem method did not pick up the loss and there is no place to turn to make it up.

This inequity, together with other attacks on the fiscal viability of New York's voluntary hospitals, including the cost control bill of 1969 and nonpayment for ambulatory services for the working poor, has led to a crisis which threatens our ability to function. The expenditure of unrestricted endowments by the four largest medical centers in the area places them in jeopardy of having to close their doors within one or two years because of the lack of available funds. Banks are certainly not eager to lend hospitals money for operating purposes. For all the above reasons the systems should pay their full share of the costs for their patients' care.

I would also hope that any reimbursement system will recognize the need for increased operating capital. With continuing inflation (and I haven't seen any signs that it will go away) the need for an increase in working capital is self-evident. We simply must have more dollars to meet next week's or next year's payroll. And, we must have something above bare bone's cost for hospitals to be able to continue to function.

As a corollary I submit that philanthropic funds should not be considered when reimbursement rates are being set. These funds are given because donors have more faith in the judgment of hospital boards' as how to expend money wisely than they have in either government or third parties. Under the rule of the late and unlamented Cost of Living Council the fruits of past giving were offset against current expenses and hospitals were told to use up their resources before seeking rate adjustments. To alter the spirit and purposes for which voluntary contributions have been given so as to affect the hospital's needs for basic reimbursement for services rendered would be immoral.

Perhaps the most significant contribution which I can make in this discussion is to emphasize the need to maintain "centers of excellence." Again, I'm referring to the re-

gional medical centers which are usually allied with educational institutions and who provide super-specialized care. The usual approach in governmental programs has not recognized the scope of services as a vital and necessary component of a health system and this has served to average down to the mediocre. The usual explanation is that it is difficult to measure scope of services in terms of so many dollars per patient day.

Recent experience with regulations proposed under Section 223 of Public Law 92-603 is a case in point. The clear intent of Congress was to include recognition of scope of services in the proposed ceiling for routine services under Section 223. Yet, regulations proposed by the Social Security Administration simply avoided the issue and proposed flat ceilings. This put institutions such as Columbia-Presbyterian, Cornell-New York, St. Vincent's and Mount Sinai in the same class as New York's municipal hospitals—a travesty of justice.

Society cannot afford to destroy or limit for lack of funds the medical centers which care for the complicated illnesses. If we are to continue to serve and to lead, we must receive the base support for patient care we require. Studies have shown that for the treatment of patients with the same illnesses costs in these medical centers are not significantly different from those of our secondary care neighbors. The problem is that we are confronted by more and more complicated serious illnesses. Unless this country is willing to allow patients with complicated illnesses to die without providing them the advantages of today's medical knowledge and developing treatments these institutions must receive appropriate funding to insure survival.

Prospective rating is a much-admired technique recommended by some for the control of hospital costs. Stated simply, the idea is that if I can project the amount of money I will have available during a fiscal year, I will tailor my spending to it. I wish it were so. But how can you budget so accurately when wage rates which account for 75% of our costs are set by collective bargaining and usually compulsory arbitration? How can we make predictions on non-wage items which are at the mercy of the general economy? We all know what has happened to food, fuel, electricity, supplies, just to mention a few items. The number of patient days, the volume of surgery and the use of increasingly expensive laboratory tests are largely controlled by the medical staff. We already run our hotel services more efficiently than in the commercial world. So where can we really reduce our expenditures? The sad truth based on unfortunate experience is that during any given year, the only way that I know to save real dollars is by closing services.

Prospective rating during an inflationary period is farcical. It can only lead to an exhaustion of reserves. Such an attempt to control a hospital's income without controlling its costs can only be described as confiscation.

Governmental programs rarely consider the impact of the unionization of hospitals. Many of New York's hospitals are unionized and more are being organized each year. As I indicated earlier, personnel costs make up three quarters of the total hospital budget and the rate of increase is unpredictable. The difference, however, between us and industry is that in the economic war which often accompanies the collective bargaining process in industry nobody is hurt except the participants. When hospital and union reach this critical position the patients suffer.

The serious eight-day strike in New York last November cost my own hospital a million dollars in operating funds. If government cannot find a way to control inflation and, in particular, salaries, government must be prepared to help meet costs when they are translated into per diem rates. There is no

other way. Hospitals, as I have said, have little or no resources left—the more we borrow, the more interest we pay, and, at higher rates. When this interest is added to other costs, as they must be, our total operating costs soar.

There is much talk about restructuring the delivery system and much of this discussion is based on little solid evidence. Perhaps the most accountable scheme for doctor-patient relationship that could have been devised is the solo practitioner fee-for-service system. The patient who doesn't like his doctor simply goes on to the next one. A patient in a large structured system such as an HMO, however, has to go through many echelons of bureaucratic review in order to get satisfaction, unless, of course, he pulls out altogether and seeks the service of a private practicing physician.

I agree that we need alternatives. But I don't think we need them as badly as it has been made out. Further, I am sure that savings, if any, will be insignificant unless we have serious under-utilization. That's where HMO's save money.

We shouldn't kid the American people. We should tell them that medical care is going to be very expensive and increasingly so as newer technology comes on the scene and as hospital workers are paid better and better. We should tell them that the only way they can cut their medical bill is by using fewer services and perhaps by avoiding physicians and hospitals altogether.

Ambulatory care, which is grossly underfunded, is necessary care. But it is not a real substitute for hospital care. No one is going to treat his coronary occlusion or have his gall bladder out in a doctor's office. Undoubtedly, unnecessary admissions can and should be prevented. But office care is not an automatic substitute for in-patient care.

Much is made of the value of prevention, particularly as an advantage presented by H.M.O.'s. In recent years, magnificent strides have been made in pediatric preventive medicine which have resulted in exaggerated expectation among adults. I wish we could live up to those expectations. Unfortunately, we do not know how to prevent any of the intrinsic, non-infectious diseases of adults, with the partial exception of the complications of hypertension, except by modifying behavior. Neither my practitioner colleagues nor my public health friends know how to get people to drive slowly, to reduce their alcoholic intake, to avoid drugs, not to commit suicide or homicide or stay fit, medical care techniques are almost worthless in either primary or secondary prevention of the serious chronic diseases of adults that cripple and kill so many of us.

Much more needs to be known about how to change the natural history of these diseases. That means much more research. Our present knowledge base is simply inadequate to permit us to do very much about prevention of adult diseases.

Should we reduce the number of hospital beds in the country? I believe so. But we should do it by closing whole hospitals, not by nibbling away at a few beds here and there. Where I think we can make a serious contribution to a more efficient system is by better structuring who goes to the secondary care hospital and who goes to the tertiary care hospitals. There is no excuse for complicated special care units in community hospitals beyond the level of the coronary care unit. There is little excuse for the tertiary care center in the community to do large numbers of hernias and tonsillectomies. We need a better sorting out of who goes where.

The corollary to this, of course, is that physicians should be on appropriate hospital staff. In other words, the super-sophisticate should not be on the staff of a secondary hospital and the general specialist, if I can use that term, should have limited access to the

regional medical center. Appropriate redistribution of patients would mean appropriate redistribution of costs and a generally better system, working to the advantage of all.

My plea today, therefore, is that we don't throw the baby out with the bath water, American medical care and the voluntary hospital system have developed a sophisticated delivery system which does extraordinarily well in specialized areas. It does not do as well as it should in primary medical care. Obviously, the answer is to have more physicians and physician extenders who are interested in primary care and who are good at it.

But this should not be at the expense of the specialist and the super-specialist, the secondary and the tertiary voluntary hospital. We must build on these strong bases. We must add rather than subtract.

If we are to have a national health insurance program in this country which will mean anything, we should encourage those forces which have helped to create a superb system of voluntary hospitals, unique to the United States and which works so well when compared with foreign systems.

Let us not destroy the very roots of this system by reducing hospital income without controlling the costs of hospital labor and supplies. Above all, let us not reduce the incentives for donors to give.

A system that recognizes the strength of voluntarism will give America the health care she needs at a price she can afford. One which ignores the advantages of voluntary support for health purposes will regress to care of lower and lower quality and eventually to mediocrity, the choice is the Congress' to make. Let it be made wisely.

COMMEMORATIVE TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE IGNACY JAN PADEREWSKI, OUTSTANDING POLISH PIANIST, COMPOSER, STATESMAN, AND PATRIOT

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Polish-American community throughout our Nation observed and commemorated the 43d anniversary of the death of a renowned ancestor of Polish heritage, the Honorable Ignacy Jan Paderewski, whose genius has contributed irreducibly to the cultural development of the world's treasure trove of musical masterpieces and his lasting international fame serves to the memory of his exceptional dedication to the Polish people etched with heroic deeds as a great patriot and a legacy as a leading statesman of the Polish nation.

On June 29, 1974, the Polish American Congress and the Polish American Community of Washington, D.C., conducted memorial services at Arlington Cemetery in his honor.

In historic preservation of his exemplary achievements, I wish to join with my colleagues here in the Congress in commemorative tribute to the memory of Paderewski, the patriot, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in our historical journal of Congress the following biographi-

cal sketch forwarded to me by Mr. Casimir Lenard, executive director of the Polish American Congress, Inc., Washington, D.C., which testifies to some of the stirring moments in the life of Paderewski who continues to inspire not only Polish nationals and Americans of Polish heritage but all peoples throughout the world for his contribution to the history and destiny of mankind:

PADEREWSKI, GREAT POLISH PATRIOT HONORED

June 29th marks the 43rd Anniversary of the Death of Ignacy Jan Paderewski, Polish pianist, composer, statesman, and patriot, who helped create modern Poland after World War I.

Paderewski's great musical talent, his special ties with the United States, and his distinguished role in the rebuilding of an independent Poland, warrant honoring his memory and his career.

Ignacy Jan Paderewski was born in 1860 in Kurylowka, Poland. He made his first public appearance as a pianist at age 12. He studied music at the Warsaw Conservatory and in Vienna under Theodor Leschetizky, the most famous teacher of the time. Paderewski made his debut in Paris in 1888, which launched his career as the best known and highest paid pianist of his time. Paderewski made his first American tour in 1891, developing a tremendous following and making influential friends in America. Extending his tour to South America, Africa and Australia, he soon became the most famous pianist in the world.

During World War I, Paderewski proved to be a great Polish patriot and statesman. Seeing the possibility of rejoining the parts of Poland divided between Germany, Russia and Austria, he gave up his concerts and devoted all of his time to this cause. He joined the Polish National Committee in Paris and as its delegate to the United States, he raised large sums of money for the Polish victims of war and for the cause of Poland's independence. Furthermore, he skillfully united various Polish American groups to work for the same end.

In close cooperation with other Polish statesmen, including Roman Dmowski, and as a friend of President Woodrow Wilson, Paderewski convinced the President of the importance of rebuilding a strong Poland for the future peace of Europe. President Wilson included this idea to his famous Fourteen Points, which became a foundation of the Paris Peace Conference in 1918.

After the War, Paderewski returned to Poland and was honored as a national hero. He was elected President of Poland, and together with Roman Dmowski represented Poland at the Paris Peace Conference. There he attended the signing of the Versailles Treaty and the opening session of the League of Nations.

His mission accomplished, Paderewski resigned his political activities in 1921 and resumed his concerts. Everywhere he went he was honored. When he played in Washington, D.C., he was a houseguest of President Herbert Hoover, and while in Rome he was invited to the Vatican by the Pope.

When Poland was invaded by Nazi Germany in 1939, Paderewski returned to politics. He joined the Polish government-in-exile in France and became President of the Polish National Council, which was a wartime parliament of Poland. Late in 1940, he returned to the United States to use his contacts for the Polish cause, as he did once before. However, this did not last long. After a brief illness, Paderewski died in New York in June 1941. By order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, his remains were interred in the USS Maine War Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery, where to this day they await return to a free Poland.

MATTEAWAN REVELATIONS HIGH-LIGHT NEED FOR ACTION ON PRISONERS' RIGHTS

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, over a year and a half ago the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals declared in its summary report on corrections that the convicted offender retains all rights that citizens in general have except those taken away in order to administer correctional institutions. Tragically, however, the basic rights of prisoners continue to be ignored and abridged in various ways and frequently lead to unrest and, at times, open violence. As the Commission so aptly observed "to learn to respect law, the offender must see that respect demonstrated as it is applied to him."

The crying need for positive action on measures to recognize and protect the basic rights and human dignity of prisoners in all areas is starkly revealed in the current series on conditions at the Matteawan State Hospital being published in the New York Daily News. Matteawan is New York State's only treatment center for the criminally insane and the conditions being revealed by reporter William Heffernan can only recall scenes out of the Dark Ages, the Inquisition, or stories by Dostoevski. As the News quite accurately editorially noted, the situation at Matteawan makes "that institution a blot on New York's name and an affront to people of conscience everywhere."

Mr. Heffernan's in-depth articles speak for themselves and warrant the most careful reflection by our colleagues. It is unconscionable that conditions such as this should prevail in this or any country and prompt and effective steps must clearly be taken by the New York State Department of Correctional Services to end the practices which are graphically discussed in these stories. I present two articles in the series herewith for inclusion in the Record along with an editorial from today's edition of the New York Daily News. I fear that the conditions described at Matteawan State Hospital may very well be only one example of similar situations throughout the country and I am hopeful that penologists and corrections officials at all levels will thoughtfully and seriously review their treatment and personnel policies and practices. Further, I am hopeful that stories such as these will spur action on measures—including my own Prisoner Rights Act—which seek to guarantee the rights of prison inmates.

The newspaper articles follow:

[From the New York Daily News, July 1, 1974]

CAN'T YOU SEE THAT THE PATIENT IS DYING?

(By William Heffernan)

Iris Quinones is a nurse at Matteawan State Hospital. She learned about brutality last Jan. 3, she says, as she watched a patient named Jose Claudio "come as close to death as you can" with a "white Turkish towel wrapped around his neck."

"I came on the ward at 8:30 a.m.," Mrs. Quinones said, "and I saw three correction officers struggling with a patient I knew. His name was Jose Claudio, a very disturbed young man who weighed about 135 pounds. 'When I came toward them, one of them shouted at me, and told me to 'get the hell in the office.' I obeyed them, because I'm supposed to, but then I stood there and watched."

I WENT TO HIM

Mrs. Quinones said she had seen the (three) officers, on the floor with Claudio. The officers, she said, were trying to place a straitjacket on him.

"He (Claudio) didn't seem to be struggling," she said. A "white Turkish towel was placed around Claudio's neck, and they began choking him," she said.

"When they finished, they placed Claudio in a chair," Mrs. Quinones said, "and I went to him. His condition was astonishing. He was a white man, but from the neck up, he was black from the strangulation. I thought he was dying."

Mrs. Quinones said she had begun administering first aid when one of the guards asked why she was so excited.

NOTHING EVER HAPPENED

"I shouted at him, 'Can't you see the patient is dying? He's almost dead now!'"

At that point, Mrs. Quinones said, she called for assistance, and two other nurses rushed to the ward.

"I began speaking to Claudio in Spanish, telling him to 'breathe Claudio, please breathe, breathe deeply,' and he began to come around."

The patient, Mrs. Quinones said, was taken to the hospital ward, only to be immediately ordered to Ward 3 (the jail ward), where he was locked in a cell. Mrs. Quinones recalled: "I went to my superior, and told him what had happened. I thought he would do something, but nothing ever happened."

Later, Mrs. Quinones said, she went to Ward 3, where, with a flashlight, she looked at Claudio through the window of his cell.

"He was in the cell, stripped naked," she said "and I could see his face was still black and the strangulation marks were on his neck and all the blood vessels had burst in the whites of his eyes."

"He was in terrible shape, and several hours had passed . . . and he still hadn't seen a doctor."

Claudio is still a patient in the hospital, she said.

The correction officers accused by Mrs. Quinones of having used the prohibited "towel treatment" refused to discuss the matter directly with The News, but eventually responded through a union representative.

DENIES USE OF TOWEL

Howard Caruso, president of Correction Officers Local 1255, which represents Matteawan officers, said that Claudio had had to be restrained and placed in a straitjacket after he had fought with another patient, but that a towel had not been used.

State Correction Commissioner Peter Preiser, advised of the allegations by The News, promised a full investigation.

A former Matteawan inmate, who was present in the ward at the time of the officers' attack, also was interviewed by The News.

The inmate has been declared competent, and has left Matteawan. He is now awaiting trial in another city, on charges that had been placed against him before he was found mentally incompetent.

The former inmate, who did not know that The News had spoken with Mrs. Quinones, also provided a detailed account of the incident. His account fully conformed with the nurse's. He identified the same correction officers as having been involved.

Two weeks after Mrs. Quinones complained about the towel treatment, she said, she

received a warning from one of the correction officers allegedly involved.

THERE'S NO QUESTION ABOUT IT

"He told me I might be attacked by a patient if I didn't cooperate with the officers in the future," the nurse said.

"There was no question he was threatening me, and there's no question he could make good the threat. He could very easily tell some patient to hurt me with the promise of some reward or better treatment," she said.

Asked whether she had ever seen a correction officer hurt by a patient, or whether she had ever been so harmed, Mrs. Quinones answered, "Never."

"You can deal with any of these patients," she said, "If you only treat them with gentleness."

"But they're not always treated that way. I had a patient (who was) beaten just for taking an extra carton of milk."

"And I can remember coming in after a weekend and finding one of my patients with a badly swollen ankle. I asked him what happened, and he told me. 'They said I fell down the stairs.' Then he was afraid to say any more."

[From the New York Daily News, July 2, 1974]

FOUR OF EIGHT MATTEAWAN DOCS NOT LICENSED HERE

(By William Heffernan)

For the 504 mental patients at Matteawan State Hospital, hope for the future runs along a slender thread stretched between the physician who treats them and the medication used to aid that care.

But behind the aging walls of Matteawan, patients often find that care placed in the hands of physicians who are not licensed to practice medicine in New York State, physicians who have failed licensing tests and physicians who could not legally open a private medical practice anywhere in this nation.

These same patients—described by state officials as the most disturbed persons under the care and custody of New York State—also find that the majority of their medication is administered not by medical personnel but by correction officers, who lack both medical training and qualifications for that delicate task.

ONLY FOUR ARE LICENSED

The medical staff of the hospital includes eight physicians and psychiatrists, only four of whom are licensed to practice in New York State.

Of the remaining four, three are not licensed to practice medicine anywhere in the United States and the fourth is licensed only in Kentucky.

To further complicate the hospital's medical situation, the three who are not licensed in the United States failed the New York State licensing examination for foreign physicians when it was given earlier this year.

On the nursing side of the medical staff, the situation is not much better. There are only 30 nurses available for the entire institution.

According to the institution's former superintendent, Dr. Paul Agnew, who was forced to resign in May, nurses were on duty on only 80 percent of the wards and only between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. Monday through Friday.

On all other shifts, including weekends, basic care for patients came directly from untrained correction officers. That care included the distribution of medication.

The State Education Law, however, is specific about who may perform nursing duties. It states that persons who are not qualified nurses may perform nursing duties only when they have been formally trained to do so and possess documentation of that train-

ing. The law also requires that those persons shall have demonstrated competence in those duties under the supervision of a professional nurse.

Under the state's controlled substance statutes, unlicensed personnel are excluded from the preparation of patient medication in the quantities used at Matteawan. Such preparation is restricted to pharmacists.

Asked about the use of unlicensed physicians, State Correction Commissioner Peter Preiser said he previously had felt unlicensed physicians working at Matteawan were receiving adequate supervision.

Based on what he found at the hospital in recent months, Preiser said he now realized he did not have adequate supervision.

The State Education Law does allow state institutions to use unlicensed physicians providing they are supervised by licensed doctors.

Agnew, who resigned under pressure on May 9, said the use of unlicensed physicians and correction officers to dispense medication was "not a good medical practice." He said the correction department is aware of the practice.

"The department placed the hospital in the position of using unlicensed physicians," Agnew said, "so we had to make the decision that an unlicensed physician was better than no physician at all."

Agnew said he had tried repeatedly to stop correction officers from administering injectable medication.

"I advised them it was illegal because they were not licensed and I was hit with a great deal of resistance and resentment," Agnew said. "They felt I was taking authority away from them and they insisted they had always been told they would be backed up if any question of legality arose."

"They wanted to run this institution and they really believed they did."

[Editorial]

BACK TO THE DARK AGES

A current series of articles by News Reporter William Heffernan has revealed conditions at Matteawan State Hospital that make that institution a blot on New York's name and an affront of people of conscience everywhere.

Among Matteawan's 915 inmates are 504 men and women who have been characterized by officials as the most seriously disturbed persons in state custody.

It is they, according to evidence uncovered by Heffernan, who have been the principal victims of neglect, indifference and brutality.

At Matteawan, the illegal use of harsh restraints appears to be commonplace. There are documented cases of patients and prisoners being viciously beaten by their custodians.

State Correction Commissioner Peter Preiser has pledged a thorough investigation of the sickening and degrading abuses that are daily occurrences at Matteawan. We trust he will follow through promptly on that promise, and take effective remedial steps.

Whatever their mental state or past records, the wretched souls of Matteawan are human beings and should receive the most humane care that a concerned and compassionate state can give.

"I HAVE A DREAM"

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to your attention and to the attention of all the Members of Congress a poem entitled "I Have A

Dream," written by my fine friend Ronnie Ted Shiffett of Rome, Ga. I know you will find his dedication in verse to the memory of the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. to be a commendable, thoughtful, and timeless statement

I HAVE A DREAM

(By Ronnie Ted Shiffett)

I have a dream, in a night of darkness,
And the night is far spent, when will day be,
And though the stars are twinkling bright,
The night is so black, that few eyes can now see

I have a dream, of freedom, of justice, of liberty,
For all God's creation, black, yellow, and white,
For all over this nation and around the world,
Some people have refused to share, the path called right

I have a dream, of peace, of love, of righteousness,
In a night possessed by war, by hate, by slavery,
And if my dream does not soon become a reality,
Then all men will suffer, and most of all, me

I have a dream, which someday mankind may try to stop,
And this mortal man, made of flesh, shall depart from me,
But let it be recorded for all men to see,
That I lived a life which few have lived,
And my life has become an eternal dream.

FINANCIAL AID FOR THE ELDERLY HOMEOWNER

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans who today face the prospect of losing the single most important asset they own and possess—their homes.

These are not the young homeowners with a 20-year mortgage. Rather, they are the over-65 homeowners—people "retired" from earning a living but still forced to pay their own way in the high-priced world in which we live. It is estimated that 70 percent of our Nation's senior citizens fit into this category.

The plight of our Nation's senior citizens, especially in these times of soaring inflation, is growing more and more desperate. Each year more of them, particularly those on fixed incomes, lose the economic struggle. Battered by the increased cost of living and escalating real estate taxes, they find the expenses of keeping their homes outpacing their ability to pay. These citizens are watching their life's dreams go on the block for nonpayment of taxes.

I find this intolerable. I believe that the elderly, who have bought and paid for their homes, are entitled to keep them. Therefore, I have introduced legislation in the Congress which will provide the elderly homeowner with direct financial aid from the Federal Treasury to reimburse him for property taxes paid to State and local governments.

Under the provisions of this legislation, the senior citizen homeowner, with a

household income of less than \$7,500 per year, would receive a Federal payment of either \$480 per year or a payment equal to his property tax bill, whichever is less. The claims of eligible individuals would be handled by the existing machinery of the Internal Revenue Service, thereby eliminating any addition to the sprawling bureaucracy which now exists in Washington.

Many elderly homeowners cannot keep up in today's tax and inflation rate. They did in the past when they were active wage earners. They bought homes, paid their taxes, and by so doing helped to educate their children and others. They helped to pay for valuable improvements in their communities. These improvements included schools, parks, and other necessary facilities. Now that they have made their contribution, they have earned the right to enjoy the fruits of their labors.

I commend this legislation to my colleagues and urge their attention and consideration to its merits.

YEAR-ROUND DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME EQUALS THREE COAL MINES AND ONE OIL REFINERY

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, year-round daylight saving time has been in effect for just over 6 months. The DOT has reported to Congress that the experience to date has resulted in an electrical energy savings of between three-fourths and 1 percent. In my view DOT is wrong to describe this as an insignificant conservation measure.

When translated into oil barrel equivalents, daylight savings time has added between 75,000 and 100,000 extra barrels of oil to the U.S. inventory every single day it has been in effect.

There are approximately 270 oil refineries in operation in the United States today, and only about 50 of them are capable of producing more than 75,000 barrels of refined petroleum a day. In other words, this daylight saving time can be viewed as effectively adding another refinery to the energy flow, without the 4-year construction delay.

The DOT report indicates that the major fuel conserved was coal. Reduction in the amount of coal burned has two important consequences: first, it means that the air has been spared substantial abuse from the resulting pollutants. Second, it means that in terms of coal production daylight saving time has been the equivalent of opening three additional mines. It is estimated that daylight savings time has resulted in the conservation of about 9,650 tons of coal a day, and since a large mine will only yield between 2,500 and 3,000 tons of coal each day this achievement is the more valuable in view of the 3 years it takes to open a new mine.

I would suggest to my colleagues that indeed daylight saving time has, when

viewed in the proper perspective, achieved a substantial saving in America's precious energy resources.

THE SPECTRUM, THE OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT BUFFALO, EDITORIALIZES ON THE RIGHT TO PRIVACY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the right to privacy—the right to be left alone—is a right to which this Congress is showing a new degree of commitment in insuring. Several hundred bills and resolutions—introduced with broad, bipartisan sponsorship—have been introduced. Many are now the subject of active consideration by the subcommittees and committees of the House and Senate.

It has been said that this 2d session of the 93d Congress may be known to history as "the privacy Congress," because of its determination to address effectively the issues associated with growing encroachments—by Government and by the private sector—on the right to privacy. Only our actions will prove the accuracy of that observation, but I can assure my colleagues that I am committed to it. I ask all to consider some cogent remarks on privacy from the campus community.

In the June 28 edition of the Spectrum, the official paper of the State University of New York at Buffalo, the very able writers and editors of that journal concentrated much of its space to this vital issue of privacy.

I believe the editorial which was featured in that edition is worthy of the attention of this House as we proceed further into the discussion of the matter. It is a valuable contribution to enhancing public knowledge of the issue and the dramatic ways in which the right to privacy of all stand to be violated unless adequate protections are insured.

Excerpts from the editorial follow:

EDITORIAL—CAN THERE EVER BE PRIVACY?

The specter of a completely modernized, totalitarian society—where people's private thoughts are monitored 24 hours-a-day and every room in every house is constantly being observed on giant television screens—usually conjures up images of George Orwell's 1984. But as far-fetched as 1984 seemed when it was first published, the numerous premeditated invasions of individual privacy by Federal and State governments during the past decade may well have vindicated Orwell as one of the more accurate prophets of modern times.

All of these abuses have underscored the dangers inherent in the numerous National Data Banks that are being used by federal agencies. The development of highly sophisticated Data Banks—with the ability to transfer information between them—has posed a grave threat to the confidentiality of individual census data, military records, educational, political, medical and psychological histories, and other potentially damaging information. A survey conducted by New York University in 1966 revealed that 75% of New York City area employment agencies had

gained access to confidential information and refused to even consider applicants with any sort of arrest record. Furthermore, people who suspected they were being stalked by federal police who knew their most carefully-guarded secrets were naturally reluctant to become involved and speak out. This form of intimidation—depriving a free citizen of the confidence that his actions will not earn him a computerized dossier in FBI files—is clearly a violation of the First Amendment.

Amid this "distributing absence of laws to control the information capabilities of government [which threatens] the individual's privacy and right to due process of law," the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights has taken positive steps toward safeguarding the rights of privacy by recommending guidelines for informing persons when information about them is being stored in Data Banks and allowing them to "review and correct their own records." The subcommittee has also proposed Congressional approval of any decision to computerize files, federal restrictions on interagency exchange of personal data, and the adoption of strict security measures to protect data and data banks.

It remains to be seen whether the post-Watergate climate will catalyze Congressional passage of the subcommittee's recommendations. And even if the proposed safeguards eventually do become law, who can be certain what effect they will have, as recent history has taught us that Federal laws are enacted so they can be broken.

Mr. Speaker, we must return to a nation of laws and respect for laws. Ends do not justify any means and I hope this Congress passes the type of privacy laws that can help restore all American's confidence in the efficiency of law.

A SAFE AND SANE FOURTH OF JULY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Fourth of July is a time for all Americans to honor America and the traditional use of fireworks has always been recognized with this patriotic holiday.

I believe that emphasis should be placed on the danger involved in the use of fireworks and the administration of the fireworks should be limited to official programs under the supervision of experienced personnel. The public is continually warned of the hazards involved in the use of fireworks but each year accidents occur that involve loss of limb, blinding, or kill individuals.

An editorial in the June 23 edition of the Suburban Life strongly urges all Americans to have a safe and sane Fourth of July. The article follows:

A SAFE AND SANE FOURTH

For years it has been recognized that fireworks, despite all their patriotic associations, present a serious safety hazard, particularly to children. Deaths, blindings, amputations and severe burns have often resulted from Fourth of July celebrations.

The U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission estimated that last year some 6,500 persons were treated in hospital emergency rooms for fireworks-related injuries. Two-thirds of these victims were under 15 years of age.

Federal law prohibits the sale to consumers of the most dangerous types of fireworks, including cherry bombs, aerial bombs, M-80 salutes and larger fireworks containing more than two grains of powder. Also banned are mail-order kits designed to build these fireworks.

While some of last year's 6,500 injuries were caused by banned fireworks that had been illegally sold, the majority were linked to legal fireworks. Illinois and some municipal laws prohibit the sale and use of most fireworks.

Yet, come the Fourth of July holiday, these laws are observed by the public about as much as the Prohibition laws were observed in the 1920s and early 1930s.

So it's up to parents to protect their young. Fireworks are not toys for children. The sparkler, considered by many the ideal 'safe' firework for the young, burns at very high temperatures and can easily ignite clothing.

Younger children should never be allowed to play with fireworks under any circumstances. They cannot appreciate the danger involved and cannot act correctly in case of emergency.

Parents who allow older children to use fireworks should be sure they use them only under close adult supervision. Any running or horseplay while they are being used only leads to tragedy when an accident occurs.

It's unfortunate that more and more area communities are finding it too costly to sponsor traditional firework displays on the Fourth. To most Americans fireworks and the Fourth are synonymous. We hope it will be a safe and sane one for all.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. MARTIN LUTHER KING, SR.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on last Sunday, June 30, 1974, while playing the organ in the church she so dearly loved; the pulpit of her father, husband, and son; the symbolic heart of this Nation's civil rights movement; Mrs. Martin Luther King, Sr., was struck down by an assailant with vengeance in his heart. Once again a senseless atrocity has been committed against one who lived in the grace of nonviolence, and the Nation is poorer for the loss.

Mrs. Alberta Williams King was a quiet, devout woman who remained behind the scenes during the turbulent times of her son, Martin Luther King, Jr.'s ascendancy as the father of the modern civil rights movement. Mrs. King did not grant interviews or speak out, but the majesty of her voice was heard in the inalterable sense of determination which her son brought to the civil rights activities of the late 1950's and early 1960's. Her voice was heard in the pronouncements of nonviolence and devotion to God made from the pulpit of her beloved Ebenezer Baptist Church by Dr. King and his followers. These sermons and speeches formed the philosophical base for the successful assault upon the citadel of segregation which had stood for a hundred years. Her voice was heard in the confidence and courage of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as he

led the countless thousands down the dusty roads to Birmingham, Selma, and Jackson. Dr. King's was a sense of destiny and devotion forged by an upbringing clothed in selfless love and dedication to the will of God. This was the undeniable legacy of his mother, Alberta Williams King.

Mrs. King was the daughter of the late Reverend A. D. Williams, former pastor of the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta. From her father's able hands the ministry of this historic temple of worship passed to her husband, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Sr., who in turn passed the ministry on to their son, the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. How ironic it is that one whose life was so engulfed by Ebenezer Baptist would be struck down by the very antithesis of that nonviolence which this holy place has come to symbolize.

It is a sad commentary of our times that this kind of senseless act so pervades our society. This tragedy must serve as a grim reminder of the distance we still have to travel in reaching the goal so eloquently described by her son. We cannot forget the words uttered by the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial on August 28 of 1963:

I say to you today, my friends, even though we face difficulties today and tomorrow, I still have a dream. It is a dream deeply rooted in the American Dream. I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up, live out the true meaning of its creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal". I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and sons of former slave-owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood. . . . I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.

Let us pray that Dr. King's four children see the fulfillment of their father's prophecy. Then perhaps the legacy of peace and love left by Alberta Williams King will live on in the hearts of her grandchildren and all the sons and daughters of all the coming generations.

America is a sadder place today with the passing of this fine woman. I join her husband, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Sr.; her daughter, Mrs. Christine Farris; her daughter-in-law, Mrs. Coretta Scott King, widow of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; and the nine grandchildren which survive her in mourning this very personal tragedy.

SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON OFFICE ACTIVITIES AND EXPENSES

HON. WAYNE OWENS

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman, it is one of my responsibilities to be open and candid with my constituency with regard to the manner in which I utilize the funds I receive to staff and run my offices and to carry out my duties as a U.S. Representative.

I promised to report to my constituency on a semiannual basis my office related activities and expenses. This is the third such report since taking office. The categories reported herein include my voting attendance record, bills sponsored and cosponsored, staff and office expenses, days spent in the district, town meetings, and legislative forums held, and average mail, phone and visitor volume during the months of January-June 1974:

Summary of activities and expenses in district offices (2)

ACTIVITY	
Personnel	
Full Time	5
Part Time	1
Interns (non salaried)	4
Total	10
Letters received (average week)	75
Letters sent (average week)	100
Telephone calls received (average week)	250
Office visitors (average week)	25
Cases (average week)	35

Expenses

Equipment and furniture (includes present value of furniture and equipment left by predecessor):	
Allowance	\$15,000.00
Utilized	13,278.87
Carpets and drapes:	
Allowance	4,500.00
Utilized, new book value as of January 1973	3,122.00
District telephone:	
District offices:	
Allowance per quarter	\$500
Utilized for 1st and 2nd quarters	1,000
Allowance per quarter	\$600
Utilized for 1st and 2d quarters	1,011.93

In-State activities

Days working in Utah:	
January	13
February	11
March	10
April	13
May	8
June	3½

Town meetings

Salt Lake County (5) (Cottonwood Heights, Central City, South Salt Lake, Rosepark, Butler Hills), Tooele County (Vernon, St. John, Tooele), Wayne County (Loa), Piute County (Junction), Coche County (Logan), Sanpete County (Manti), Weber County (Ogden), Utah County (Provo); Legislative Forum on Impeachment (University of Utah).

Summary of activity and expenses in Washington office

Activity	
Personnel:	
Full time	10
Interns	9
Total	19
Letters received (average week)	350
Letters sent (average week)	300
Telephone calls received (average week)	450
Telephone calls placed (average week)	500
Office visitors (average week)	20
Constituent requests (average week)	25
Constituent cases (average week)	15

Expenses

Equipment:	
Allowance	\$5,500.00
Utilized	4,837.47
Equipment leased (per month):	
Allowance (plus up to \$250 from clerk)	350.00
Utilized	421.20

Computer addressing:	
Allowance (up to remainder of \$250 leasing allowance (per month))	
Utilized	\$911.00
Washington office expenses:	
Allowance	5,250.00
Utilized	5,250.00

Total salary schedule

Allowance (minus leasing and computer expenses)	\$95,663.80
Utilized	95,661.31

Legislation and voting statistics

Bills sponsored or cosponsored	139
Resolutions sponsored or cosponsored	30
Voting attendance record	91.1
Attendance record	92.7

SPEECH BY GOVERNOR WALKER

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 18 the Governor of Illinois, the Honorable Dan Walker spoke before the National Coal Association convention in Washington, D.C.

In the address Governor Walker discussed the role that coal can play in meeting our energy needs and what the State of Illinois is doing to promote the utilization of coal. As the Governor pointed out, the State of Illinois has approximately 148 billion tons of bituminous coal, the largest deposit of coal in the United States.

As a means of utilizing this vast resource, Governor Walker outlined several important programs the State of Illinois had supported to realize the potential of these massive coal deposits, including continued environmental technology, coal liquefaction and gasification. As a member of Governor Walker's coal committee I am particularly pleased by his statement that "coal is not a dirty word."

For the benefit of my colleagues I include the text of Governor Walker's address at this point in the Record:

REMARKS BY ILLINOIS GOV. DAN WALKER TO THE NATIONAL COAL ASSOCIATION CONVENTION

Illinois is known as the Land of Lincoln and the Land of Prairies but it is equally, the Land of Coal. In fact, the first discovery of coal on the entire North American continent is credited to Joliet and Father Marquette in their famous voyage of exploration in 1673. But serious mining of Illinois coal didn't begin until 150 years later when flatboats were first loaded with coal and sent to New Orleans. And what history will undoubtedly find even more interesting is that another 150 years later, in the 1970s, coal emerges to assume a crucial role in supplying our nations' energy.

About two weeks ago, I said on Meet The Press that people are tired of Washington's preoccupation with Watergate, Watergate, Watergate—and are more vitally concerned with what I called the three "E's": Ethics, Economy, and Energy. I want to mention this preoccupation with Watergate again because in a very real sense it has contributed to the untimely distraction of those who determine, by decision or neglect, this nation's priorities.

Some time back, a comic strip called "Doonesbury" had a series of cartoons on

then Energy Czar William Simon. In the cartoon, Simon was trying to figure out how to solve the energy crisis. And, finally, as czars do, he came up with a solution: he simply announced that the crisis was over. Less amusing is the fact that this is essentially what seems to have happened.

The energy problem is still with us. As President Nixon and Secretary of State Kissinger make headlines from the Middle East, the energy problem loses its sense of urgency in the public mind. Make no mistake—I, like you—welcome peace in the Mideast and congratulate those who brought it about. But that area of the world has seen truces before—and wars again. We cannot, we must not let the energy future of the United States of America hinge on the uncertainties of international events.

For years, other great powers have followed the precarious course of maintaining their greatness through international diplomacy and special trade relations. The result was dependence on others. Those nations that followed those policies ultimately saw their power eroded. In the energy area, we would be much better off developing our own energy resources. And that means, in great part, coal.

The President recognized this, I believe, when he embarked on his energy program. Yet, the federal program designed to bring energy self-sufficiency for America appears to be running out of, well, energy. And as so often happens, the problem has been thrown in the laps of the states and the private sector—in this case, those in the business of energy.

So, gentlemen, if we are to achieve the President's goal of energy self-sufficiency by 1980 we should first realize that it won't be done with ballyhoo and it won't be done by directive at any level of government.

It will be done only if government and industry are willing to set aside adversary roles and assume new roles of cooperation. And I came here today to propose that kind of cooperation on developing coal as a primary energy resource.

Before I discuss some of those ideas I want to stress that we can increase our use of coal without damaging the environment. I am against lowering federal air quality standards as a quick and easy way to increase the use of coal. This would be wrong and dangerous. We have reliable evidence that sulfur oxide emissions from burning high-sulfur Illinois coal can kill or maim as surely as a fire in a nursing home. It is no answer to say that we should meet our energy needs by victimizing the asthmatics and older citizens who are the first to fall from this pollution. Our real energy answer is to maintain our determination to make clean fuels from coal.

But, having said that, let me emphasize this—coal is not a dirty word. And some purists do our nation a disservice by blocking efforts to burn coal as coal, just as those who do a disservice by insisting on charging ahead without regard to health hazard fallout.

We must explore—now—every feasible way of controlling emissions while we burn coal as coal. And no agreements or uneasy truces abroad which seem to assure supplies of oil should deter us from that effort. Scrubbing devices, washing devices, intermittent control devices—all must be explored. And we desperately need better methods of exchanging information and coordinating research in these areas here and abroad.

In Illinois, we are working very hard to remove obstacles and speed progress on coal development projects.

The state is funding a coal scrubbing project at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale in the heart of our vast coal reserves. We are optimistic that we can develop a commercially feasible coal scrubbing procedure for Illinois coal.

We have also planned a series of three conferences, the first having been held in March in Chicago. We brought together environmentalists, industry, government and business leaders to discuss our energy problems and the future use of coal. That conference served, I believe, the very useful purpose of opening the dialog on coal development. The second conference will be held in the fall in Southern Illinois and will deal with technological developments in coal and coal conversion.

Based on reports of favorable results from TVA I have requested that the Illinois Pollution Control Board hold hearings on the use of intermittent control devices. I have met with coal industry leaders to try as much as possible to devise a common position before the Pollution Control Board. I understand that they have made real progress in finding such commonality. We are willing to be guided by the data on intermittent controls; not by any prejudice against coal. We will not take steps that will be shown to harm the environment, but we will not back away from our most plentiful energy resource because of unfounded fears.

Illinois is also taking a leadership role in encouraging the development of coal liquefaction and gasification. I have asked our Legislature for a 100 million dollar bond issue to finance this program. The internationally known consulting firm of Arthur D. Little of Cambridge, Massachusetts, is advising us. We are going all out to assist industry in locating their plants in Illinois, and we've already had some success: Columbia Coal Gasification Corporation and the Carter Oil Company signed agreements on May 15 which could lead to the development of a gasification plant and three large supporting mines in Illinois. Monterey Coal will soon announce the opening of a new mine in Illinois, one of the largest deep shaft mines in Illinois.

Northern Illinois Gas Company and the State of Illinois have made joint presentations to the Office of Coal Research for a demonstration gasification plant in Illinois.

And we've been in contact with officials from Texaco and Standard, among others, to discuss with everyone interested the tremendous potential of Illinois as an ideal place for new mines.

Discussions currently are underway between the State EPA and a consortium of major industries in the highly industrialized Alton-Wood River area near East St. Louis. The goal is to see if a workable Intermittent Control System plan can be developed for a location which includes power plants, chemical plants, and other heavy industries.

The Illinois EPA also has interpreted existing regulations to say that plants which previously burned coal and were converted to oil and gas will not be regarded as new facilities if they are converted back to coal. This gives us the flexibility to allow more time to meet less stringent emission limits and further encourages the use of coal wherever possible.

We have testified in support of semi-automatic utility rate increases which are to cover the costs of valid expenditures for the installment of needed pollution control equipment. This is part of the process of recognizing that protecting the public health is part of the legitimate cost of producing a product or providing a service.

Illinois has approximately 148 billion tons of bituminous coal, the largest deposit of such coal in the United States. And that coal is in the middle of a voracious energy market.

Because of our high-energy coal, our great water and transportation resources, our skilled labor force, our large electric power companies, and our ever-growing industrial demand for energy, commercial coal conversion plants will almost certainly be located in Illinois within the next decade. And the

State of Illinois has given its bi-partisan commitment to help coal development projects. We will help new industry with potential environmental problems, solid waste disposal, water supply, transportation, and assistance in recruiting and training the work force necessary to operate the huge new mines needed for coal conversion projects.

But I do want to stress that large scale liquefaction and gasification of coal are some years away. The technology on a large plant basis is not perfected. While we move ahead aggressively towards completing such plants, we must do all we can to burn more coal this year and next year. We must train more engineers and miners—for new mines will be useless without them.

I have convened in Illinois a meeting of representatives of our major coal producers, the Coal Producers Association, the United Mine Workers and our universities and junior colleges. They are developing short and long range programs to provide the training that will be needed as more new mines are opened in our state. And we hope to get back many trained men who have left our mines for employment elsewhere. Many of these men left Southern Illinois as mines were closed. They want to come back to Southern Illinois—and we want them there.

Overall, let me say this. We must not, in America, be lulled back into energy complacency. We must not relax our efforts. True, the gas station lines are gone—for now. But the international energy shortage remains—still hangs over our heads. No headlines from the Middle East should obscure that fact.

So let's keep talking, let's keep planning, let's keep acting on coal. Coal as gas; coal as liquid—and coal as coal. American coal. Let's develop this tremendous American energy source.

At our first Illinois coal conference I had the honor of driving the first car ever fueled by gasoline converted from coal. Illinois coal of course. That was a modest contribution to history.

I don't know if anything historic will take place at our next conference September 17 and 18 in Carbondale, but I would like to extend an invitation to each of you to attend.

I believe conferences such as the ones we are having in Illinois and the one you are having here will serve as a constant prod to keep our energy program alive and progressing.

We cannot permit our economy to sputter and choke because of an inadequate energy supply.

PRESIDENTIAL THANKS FOR SUPPORT

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, by request of my constituent, William J. Keyson, I would like to enter these newspaper articles in the RECORD:

A PRESIDENTIAL "THANKS" GOES TO MRS. BLEISTINE FOR LETTER OF SUPPORT

CAMDEN.—In the March 29 issue of the Star Herald, Mrs. Cyril Bleistine, Sr., of Penns Grove, strongly rebutted in a letter a previous column calling for the impeachment of Richard Nixon which was authored by Fr. Thomas Legere, associate pastor of St. Peter Celestine parish, Cherry Hill.

Speaking as a member of the "World War II generation," Mrs. Bleistine defended the chief executive's position in the current Watergate scandals and lauded his admin-

istration accomplishments in both foreign and domestic affairs.

She concluded her letter with this summation:

"Yes, where is justice when the great deeds of this quiet, effective, good leader are completely ignored and the overzealous efforts of some of his aides have been exploited beyond reason, fairness and sanity?"

Some two weeks following publication of her letter, Mrs. Bleistine was "quite amazed" to find in her mailbox a personal letter of gratitude from the President (below).

Since the time of publication and receipt of the White House letter a number of new developments have taken place regarding the Watergate proceedings, not the least of which include the release of the Presidential transcripts.

Despite these new disclosures on presidential conduct, Mrs. Bleistine said she still supports President Nixon today and stands by her original statements praising the president.

"I'm honored and surprised that he would take the time to respond," she said. "And I feel more than ever that he will be vindicated in the end."

As for Fr. Legere—he still believes the House of Representatives should issue a vote for impeachment but, in the future, he said, he'll be more conscious of the terminology utilized in proposing governmental action against the president.

"You never know who's reading the paper," he said.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 16, 1974.

Mrs. C. BLEISTINE, Sr.,
Penns Grove, N.J.

DEAR MRS. BLEISTINE: The many messages of encouragement I have received in past weeks have been most heartening, and I was especially gratified by your recent letter to the editor which was recently brought to my attention.

Your comments assure me that faith in our country remains strong, and that the people of our Nation—who have contributed so much to the progress of mankind—will help us to achieve the great goals we seek for America and for the world.

With my appreciation and best wishes,
Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, before long the House will have before it a bill to provide for a major impetus in geothermal research, development, and demonstration.

The inclusion of demonstration is important. Many people have the impression that geothermal energy is an exotic source fit only for some distant and future date.

But the fact remains that it need not be so far off. Indeed, some areas of the world are benefiting from its fruits today.

A recent article in the New York Times recounts the story of the city of Reykjavik, capital of Iceland, which is heated almost entirely by geothermal energy; 99 percent of the city's 85,000 residents now live in homes heated by hot water.

Such good use is made of the water that it is recycled and recycled until

every possible ounce of heat is used. In parts of the city, after the water has been used to heat buildings it is dumped into local heated swimming pools. It is also sometimes mixed with water coming from wells that are particularly hot. And some is used to heat greenhouses which produce tomatoes, grapes—even bananas—for this decidedly nontropical country.

Reykjavik now enjoys clean skies for the first time in decades, and her residents face a heating bill one-quarter that of their old bills.

The wells are drilled directly under the town.

The geothermal energy being put to use by this town is only one of many sources and varieties of geothermal power which is possible in the world. It is granted everyone cannot be so lucky as to live over a large pool of good and hot water. But some geothermal resources contain energy in forms other than heat—forms such as methane and extremely high pressures available upon release as kinetic energy. Some geothermal resources contain valuable byproducts such as potable water and mineral compounds which would add to our natural resources reserves.

Work does need to be done; a lot of work. But I think we can look at the example of Reykjavik and take note. This is a real possibility we are dealing with, not an engineer's toy.

I would like to reprint the New York Times June 22, 1974, article in the RECORD at this time:

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1974]
ICELAND'S CAPITAL WARMED BY GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

(By Walter Sullivan)

Reykjavik, Iceland, has become the first in the world to be heated almost entirely by geothermal energy and, in view of soaring fuel costs, other Icelandic communities are rapidly following suit.

The changeover to geothermal heating has been expedited by the discovery that the capital stands directly over deep reservoirs of water, some of which are as hot as 275 degrees Fahrenheit. To tap this resource, 32 bore holes have been drilled through thousands of feet of lava. Fourteen of the holes are now supplying heating water to the city.

Each successful penetration—in some cases to a depth of a mile or more—is announced to occupants of the surrounding apartment houses and department stores by a window-rattling roar. The fire department is summoned and, with a deluge of cold water, quenches the eruption long enough for plumbing fixtures to be installed at the wellhead.

A GROWING EFFORT

Over the last decade, the production of hot water has almost doubled: 99 per cent of the city's 85,000 residents now live in homes heated by hot water.

While Iceland leads the world in per capita use of geothermal heating, she has not pressed the development of geothermal power plants, partly because she has a plentiful supply of hydroelectric energy. But, in the United States and some other countries, there is a growing effort to extract electric generating power from deposits of hot water or hot rock as a result of energy problems.

Iceland is planning one geothermal power plant in the north that would generate 55 million watts. At Lake Myvatn, also in the north, the heat from "wet" steam is being used to dry diatomite for export. Diatomite, or diatomaceous earth, is of oceanic origin,

formed almost entirely of microscopic diatom shells. It is used for filters, high temperature insulation and other industrial purposes.

Parallel with the conversion to geothermal heating has been the development of a new technology to exploit it. For example, when the water comes out of the ground, it is so hot that it would boil in the pipes unless kept under high pressure. This is done by pumps inserted into the wells.

Furthermore, there is enough dissolved nitrogen in the water to give a home plumbing system a problem similar to "the bends." The latter is the sometimes fatal condition that occurs when deep-sea divers surface so rapidly that the nitrogen in their blood forms bubbles, blocking blood vessels. In this case, the nitrogen would accumulate at high points in the plumbing.

The solution has been to purge the water of nitrogen by briefly allowing it to decompress and boil.

Because the water is free of gaseous oxygen, its dissolved minerals do not form oxide deposits in the pipes, but special measures are necessary to keep oxygen from entering the system. The fluoride content of the water is reportedly ideal for dental health. However, the sulphur compounds turn silver black and corrode copper utensils.

In a recent visit to a new, smartly furnished Reykjavik apartment both a dishwasher and a washing machine were using geothermal water. But for washing silver and copperware, the housewife heated water from the cold water tap on her electric stove.

NO MARKED TASTE

Sampling water from the hot water tap revealed no marked taste, although the output of some wells had a slightly sulphurous odor.

In parts of the city after the heating water has been used it is dumped into local swimming pools (including a magnificent municipal pool that is the city's show-piece), or is mixed with water coming from wells that are particularly hot. This brings the water temperature down to manageable levels.

The residual water is also used to heat greenhouses that, despite Iceland's cool climate, produce tomatoes, grapes and even bananas.

As recently as the nineteen-forties the city was often blanketed with black smoke, particularly in winter. Today it is largely smoke-free and the fire department is less busy, now that home furnaces and combustion-type space heaters have been eliminated.

The air is not entirely free of smoke, because some industries burn oil, as do plants that generate power during periods of peak demand. However, it is estimated that Icelandic imports of fuel oil have been reduced by 200,000 metric tons a year through the development of geothermal heating.

Soviet specialists have reported a saving, in 1970, of 15 million tons of fuel through the use of geothermal energy, chiefly for heating. The saving, to Icelandic homeowners, is said to be 26 per cent of the cost of oil heating.

The reservoirs of geothermal water are apparently deposits of gravel and other permeable material left by the ice ages and later covered by lava flows thousands of feet thick. The water is far purer than the corrosively salty water of many geothermal areas, such as the Imperial Valley of Southern California.

BAKING BY BURYING

For centuries, Icelanders washed their clothes in hot springs and, in some areas, baked bread by burying a loaf-sized oven in the hot ground. Such baking took a day or more. The first district system for home heating was completed in 1930 but, until a few years ago, Reykjavik depended on wells about 10 miles away.

Prospecting that uses sensitive measurements of local gravity, magnetism and the

electrical conductivity of the earth has disclosed that there are reservoirs directly beneath the city, as well as others nearby. The producing lifetimes of the wells vary and the rate at which such reservoirs will reconstitute themselves remains uncertain. One well that ran dry is now being drilled deeper in the expectation that a new waterladen layer will be tapped. And, it is believed, additional reservoirs should keep the city warm into the indefinite future.

RECHARGEABLE HEART PACEMAKER

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, it was more than 5 years ago, on July 20, 1969, that man first landed on the Moon.

The mission to the Moon began in mid-1961 when this Nation committed itself to send a man to the Moon and return him safely to Earth.

Thousands of men and women were involved in that mission and thousands continue working today to insure that the benefits of our Moon missions and other manned space flights do not go unreaped.

The enormous technical and scientific advances for this effort required the pioneering of new frontiers not only in the aerospace field but also in a wide variety of disciplines ranging from astronomy to zoology.

It is generally agreed that this accelerated national effort compressed into roughly a decade the normal technological advances of several.

Now, 5 years after Neil Armstrong first stepped on the Moon, a vast reservoir of space-developed technology exists. It has become an invaluable national resource.

Down-to-earth applications of space technology by industry, the medical community, other Governmental agencies—in short the Nation—provide an added bonus to the taxpayer for his original space investment.

Today, the by-products of space technology are being applied in almost every field of human activity—from new conveniences in our daily lives, to helping solve some of the most serious problems facing modern society. Ironically, because of the speed with which space technology has been introduced into the mainstream of modern life, few Americans appear to appreciate the extent to which this technology has already helped to improve the quality of their lives.

RECHARGEABLE HEART PACEMAKER

Perhaps the single most important recent innovation using space technology is the rechargeable heart pacemaker.

This revolutionary device, adapting NASA-developed battery and circuitry techniques, was designed and built by the Applied Physics Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University.

Not only is it smaller than earlier devices, but, more importantly, its nickel-cadmium batteries can be recharged by the patient at home using an external power source. This eliminates the need

for replacement surgery every 2 years—an especially attractive feature for infants and the elderly.

The device is implanted under the skin in the upper left or upper right portion of the chest. Because it is about one-third the volume, and one-half the weight and thickness of earlier pacemakers, it is virtually hidden in the patient's body. It is enacted in a body-compatible, hermetically sealed, metal enclosure, which keeps out body fluids.

Over 100 new pacemakers have been implanted in human patients thus far. Its cost is competitive with conventional pacemakers and it is estimated that the potential savings resulting from the new pacemaker are in the neighborhood of \$100 million a year.

TELESCARE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SYSTEM

Another new and unique medical application has been developed out of NASA's efforts to miniaturize and toughen medical equipment for manned space flight. This is an emergency medical kit called Telecare which permits patient diagnosis and treatment at the scene of an emergency.

A key component of the 18-kilogram—40-pound—ambulance-stored device is a two-way voice and telemetry communications unit which permits trained emergency medical technicians to administer prompt, professional on-the-scene care under radio supervision of the physician.

The suitcase-size unit, developed by SCI Systems, Inc., Houston, Tex., also brings together for the first time in a single portable package a respiratory resuscitation system, a 15-minute oxygen supply contained in a light-weight canister developed from space technology, a defibrillator for external heart stimulation, a semiautomatic indirect blood pressure measurement system similar to the one used by the Skylab astronauts, and a pharmaceutical pack. Supplementary emergency medical equipment is also available to augment the basic system.

Field tests of the Telecare system were successfully carried out last year under supervision of the Harris County Medical Society in Houston. As a result, the City of Houston Fire Department is equipping 28 rescue vehicles with Telecare and training technicians in their operation. Other city governments around the country are evaluating Telecare for possible use in their emergency medical services program.

FUEL CELLS GENERATE ELECTRIC POWER

Although the basic concept of the fuel cell—combining oxygen and hydrogen to form electricity and water—is over 100 years old, the research and development effort needed to bring the concept to reality was both time-consuming and expensive.

The breakthrough came primarily from the development by Pratt & Whitney of fuel cells for Apollo spacecraft. This led eventually to the development of modified fuel cells for electric power generation on Earth.

The Apollo fuel cells used pure oxygen and hydrogen. Since these fuels are not economical for power generation, a means had to be found for using stand-

ard gas and liquid fuels augmented with oxygen from ambient air.

In the past 10 years, about \$70 million has been spent to develop fuel cell technology.

In 1967, 28 major utility companies joined Pratt & Whitney to form a joint development and demonstration program called Target—Team To Advance Research for Gas Energy Transformation. Thus far, 12.5-kilowatt fuel-cell generators have been set up at 35 locations around the world. These units have operated for more than 200,000 hours.

At the present time, fuel cells are used to augment existing power-generation facilities. However, even larger capacity modules are being planned as part of a \$300 million program initiated by a consortium of nine U.S. electric power companies. In view of the world energy crisis, commercial development of fuel cells is most timely.

COMPUTER IMAGE ENHANCEMENT FOR ATHEROSCLEROSIS TREATMENT

Computer image enhancement techniques developed by the Jet Propulsion Laboratory have been adapted to analyze blood vessel X-rays to determine changes in the size of plaques which form on blood vessel walls.

The plaques cause hardening of the arteries—atherosclerosis—which leads to high blood pressure and heart disease.

The image enhancement technique—developed originally to analyze image data from the Mariner Mars spacecraft—permits direct measurement of changes in the size of atherosclerotic plaques.

As applied by researchers at JPL and the University of Southern California, blood vessel X-ray enhancement has proved to be a quick and economical method in establishing treatment standards for atherosclerosis. Until now, the effectiveness of diet, exercise, and drug treatment could only be compared by studying heart attack and death rates of different groups of people with the disease.

To date, X-ray pictures of the main artery in the thigh have been taken in about 80 patients. The pictures are processed on a computer to obtain a measurement of blood vessel edge irregularity. Repeat X-rays help determine plaque progression or regression rates. From these studies, it is hoped that standards for exercise, diet, and weight loss can be established to help in the development of more effective treatment methods for atherosclerosis sufferers.

SEPARATION OF NONFERROUS SCRAP METAL

For years ferrous metals have been reclaimed from scrap by relatively cheap, simple methods. However, until recently, separating and reclaiming nonferrous metals such as copper, zinc, and aluminum from scrap has been costly and difficult.

Research conducted at the NASA Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, on the properties of magnetically responsive fluids, called ferrofluids, as propellants under zero gravity conditions has resulted in development of techniques that now make it commercially feasible to separate previously wasted nonferrous metals.

A ferrofluid is a colloidal suspension

of tiny magnetic particles in a liquid. The particles are so small they do not settle. Thus, when a magnetic field is applied, the entire fluid responds like a magnetic substance. The relative density of the liquid can be changed when it is subjected to a varying magnetic field. This characteristic, when suitably controlled, allows for the separation by a "sink-float" technique, of metals of different relative density.

A prototype sink-float ferrofluid non-ferrous metal separator has been built by Avco Systems Division, Lowell, Mass., under a NASA contract. The device is able to separate nonmagnetic metals from shredded scrap after ferrous metals have been removed. Metals differing in density as little as 10 percent can be separated. In view of rising metal prices and the large amounts of electrical power needed to produce new metals, the new technique has great economic potential.

PAPER MONEY IDENTIFIER

A simple paper money identifier for blind business persons has been developed from NASA technology.

The device enables a blind person to identify denominations of paper money by their sound "signature." Until now, no reliable paper money identifier for the blind has been available.

To determine its denomination, a bill is passed under a light on the small, inexpensive device. A phototransistor measures changes in the bill's light patterns. An oscillator then converts the signals into sounds similar to telephone "beeping" tones. Each denomination gives off its own easily identified sounds.

The "talking money" concept was developed by NASA's biomedical applications team at the Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio, Tex. It stems from technology first reported in 1969 by NASA for the semiautomatic inspection of microfilm records.

Tests of an early version of the money identifier were successfully conducted by Arkansas Enterprises for the Blind in Little Rock. It was found that after about 3 hours of practice, a subject could easily distinguish the sound patterns of different denominations of paper money.

The money identifier is produced by Marchak Engineering & Manufacturing Co., Austin, Tex. It is available to training centers and schools for the blind as well as individuals.

RESOLUTION ON VALUE OF RAILROADS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, mass transportation is the transportation of the future. Yet it need not be based solely on super-subway systems, slow and expensive to build. Right now, we must make use of an invaluable resource for conquering the energy crisis: the railroads. Rail service is vital as an option to energy-consuming cars and buses.

At the most recent New York Conference of Mayors and Municipal Officials, a resolution recognized the importance of the railroad to the people of New York. I insert into the Record a copy of the resolution, and I urge my colleagues to give it their close attention:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the members of the New York State Conference of Mayors are deeply concerned that the residents and industries of their particular communities be provided with the best, the most efficient, and the most economical passenger and freight train service possible; and

Whereas, the members of the New York State Conference of Mayors are concerned that the planning process authorized by the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 be so conducted as to produce the optimum rail system; and

Whereas, the officers and counsel of the New York State Conference of Mayors have coordinated their efforts in this regard with the Commissioner of Transportation of the State of New York and the staff of the New York State Department of Transportation, which coordination included conferences at the Department of Transportation in Albany, testimony at Interstate Commerce Commission hearings in Washington, D.C., and testimony at Interstate Commerce Commission hearings in the city of Albany; and

Whereas, the officers of the New York State Conference of Mayors do agree with and approve the presentation made by the Department of Transportation to the Interstate Commerce Commission Rail Services Planning Office with respect to the report issued by the Secretary of Transportation on or about February 2, 1974 and with the Department of Transportation comments to the Rail Services Planning Office on its proposed standards for determining "revenue attributable to the rail properties," "avoidable costs of providing service," and the "reasonable return on the value"; and

Whereas, the Secretary of Transportation of the United States did promulgate in the Federal Register of April 5, 1974, certain rules and regulations defining procedures for the acquisition of subsidy funds available under § 402 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973; and comments being required on those proposed rules on or about June 4, 1974; and copies of the comments on those proposed rules submitted by the Transportation Department of the State of New York having been made available for the inspection of the members of this Conference; and

Whereas, the Counsel of this Conference having recommended that the Conference adopt a Resolution approving and supporting the Commissioner of Transportation in his efforts to insure preservation of the best possible rail system, and in particular, approving and endorsing the comments of the Department of Transportation with respect to the rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of Transportation pursuant to § 402 of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that

The members of the New York State Conference of Mayors, in annual convention assembled, do hereby approve the efforts of the Commissioner of Transportation to preserve for the State of New York the best possible rail system, and

The members of the New York State Conference of Mayors, in annual convention assembled, do hereby endorse, approve and adopt the comments of the Department of Transportation of the State of New York in a document dated May 31, 1974 entitled "Comments of the New York State Department of Transportation" in Part 255—Assistance to States and Local and Regional Transportation Authorities in the Region for the

Continuation of Local Rail Services Pursuant to § 402 of Title IV of the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973, and

Each member of this Conference be requested to apprise the member of the United States House of Representatives representing his district of this action and request the support of that Congressman; and

The Secretary of the New York State Conference of Mayors, be directed to apprise the two United States Senators from the State of New York of this action and request their assistance; and

The Secretary of the New York State Conference of Mayors, in annual convention assembled, be directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the National League of Cities, Conference of Mayors, with the request that it be considered and adopted at the annual convention to be held in the month of June, 1974, in San Diego, California.

I, Raymond J. Cothran, Executive Director of the Conference of Mayors and Municipal Officials, do hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the mayors and other municipal officials assembled at the 65th Annual Meeting of the Conference of Mayors and Municipal Officials held at the Concord Hotel, Kiamasha Lake, New York, on June 6, 1974.

FATHER TOM GAVIN, S.J., WRITES THAT WE HAVE MUCH FOR WHICH TO BE THANKFUL ON THIS FOURTH OF JULY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this week we commemorate the 198th anniversary of the proclamation of our Declaration of Independence, a proclamation which signified the united will of a people to exercise the rights of free men.

The writing of that Declaration—and its proclamation—required the highest degree of courage among its proponents. We too often forget—because it was a successful endeavor they undertook—the great risks which were taken by those gallant men and women who by their actions insured our independence. When the signers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, it was not without their knowledge that should they have failed, they would have had their properties confiscated and their lives lost upon the gallows.

As we celebrate the Fourth of July—every Fourth of July—we should be ever mindful that our commitment to freedom must never be so inadequate as to risk the loss of all that for which the Framers fought—the rights and liberties of free men.

We have much for which to be thankful on this Fourth of July.

Father Tom Gavin, S.J., has made this point well in his informative column this week in the Western New York Catholic, an outstanding publication circulated widely among the clergy and laity of western New York.

Father Gavin talks about why we should never despair when events seem distressing to us. In this time of crisis of confidence in our institutions, we can too easily look at only the bad, overlooking the vast amount of good in our in-

stitutions, our Government, our leaders, and our people.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Father Gavin's column to the attention of all my colleagues. It makes the case well for a rebirth of that Spirit of '76 so essential to a regeneration of the strength of our Nation.

The column follows:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(By Father Tom Gavin, S.J.)

Q. As Independence Day approaches I find it more and more difficult each year to work up any feeling of enthusiasm, much less of patriotism. It seems to me that our nation is deteriorating. The whole picture frightens me. The Vietnam War just about finished me off.

A. No question about it, we are going through some difficult times. At times like these it is essential, if one wants to keep a balance view, to put things in perspective. Let us not forget that a very few short years ago we had legalized slavery of human beings, child labor, sweat shops, wars of aggression and even denied women the right to vote. All these things we took for granted.

Perhaps the biggest step backward that we have taken in modern times is legalized abortion and the resulting slaughter of so many unborn children. That, I agree, is frightening.

But aside from those infants there has never been more independence for everybody than there is in America today. In this country you may not only criticize the government with impunity, you can slander the nation's leaders without penalty. In Russia, China and the captive nations mere disagreement can mean your head. Communist China has put to death around 20,000,000 of her own people who happened to have contrary opinions. Khrushchev starved to death 5,000,000 Ukrainians because they wouldn't "go along". We all know what has happened in Hungary and Poland and the fate of hundreds of thousands of dissenters in Russia. One may not even leave East Germany without risking a bullet in the back.

Far from waging aggressive wars, we have risked bankruptcy in an effort to rehabilitate our former enemies. As Henry Cabot Lodge said in the United Nations, "At the end of World War II we alone had the nuclear bomb, the largest air force and navy in the world. Had we wished to we could have annihilated Russia." Instead we now sell her wheat, subsidized by the American taxpayers. We did our best to defend a free people in South Korea and South Vietnam.

As our present envoy to South Vietnam, Ambassador Graham A. Martin, said in a recent interview: "Many Americans have forgotten that our real emotional involvement in Indo-China affairs began in 1954, with a characteristic American humanitarian response when we helped move almost a million—mostly Catholic—Vietnamese from North to the South. They abandoned everything of material value, choosing to become penniless refugees in the South rather than remain under the totalitarian rule of Hanoi. . . . Our present commitment arises from an even more characteristic American trait—our determination and pride that we finish what we set out to do. And in this case, it is to leave Vietnam economically viable, militarily capable of defending itself with its own manpower, and its people free to choose their own government and their own leaders. I am thoroughly convinced that this goal can be achieved rather quickly."

As the Canadian television commentator, Gordon Sinclair, said, "This Canadian thinks it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most generous and probably the least appreciated people of all the earth. Germany and Japan, and to a lesser extent, Britain and Italy, were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions of

debts. . . . When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans who propped it up. . . . When distant cities are hit by earthquakes it is the United States who hurries in to help. . . . When the railways of France and Germany and India were breaking down through age, it was the Americans who rebuilt them. . . . I can name you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble."

And we are still doing the very same generous things. At the moment, as you know, we are protecting the people of Western Europe and trying to alleviate the hunger of starving millions in Africa and India. It is obvious that we don't brag about these things ourselves. How often have you heard these facts recounted in your newspapers or television broadcasts? It took a Canadian to acknowledge them.

No wonder God has blessed this nation so bountifully. Let us pray for our leaders in the present difficulties and thank God from the bottom of our hearts that you and I enjoy independence not only on July 4th, but on every day of the year. If it were not for that you could not have written your letter.

TRIBUTE TO H. R. GROSS

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, many tributes have been paid to our distinguished colleague from Iowa (Mr. Gross). Just recently, a feature article about him appeared in the Los Angeles Times which I believe, sums up, and captures the spirit of the great contribution he has made to responsible government. The phrase "political courage" at its best applies to H. R. Gross, and his political career should be held up as a model to every fledgling politician. In fact, I would like to see the Times article placed in political science textbooks and campaign manuals all over this country.

I commend it to the Congress and the Nation, as follows:

HOUSE'S GREAT NAY-SAYER DECIDES TO QUIT
(By John H. Averill)

WASHINGTON.—After a quarter of a century raising hell over big spending, foreign aid, junketeering and boondoggling, one of the great nay-sayers in congressional history is giving up in despair and frustration.

"I'm fed up with the futility of this place. I'm 75 years old and there is not much light left at the end of the tunnel."

Thus does Rep. H. R. Gross (R-Iowa) explain his decision to retire after representing Iowa's 3rd Congressional District for 13 two-year terms—his final one ending next Jan. 3.

Since entering the House in 1949, Gross has been variously characterized as the abominable no-man, a pillar of parsimony, a reactionary nitpicker, the watchdog of the Treasury, the conscience of the House and a man of courage and candor.

The label applied to him varies from day to day, depending on whose toes he has stepped on last or whose cause he has championed.

When Vice President Ford was House Minority Leader, he once remarked:

"There are three parties in the House—Democrats, Republicans and H. R. Gross."

There is considerable accuracy in that observation. No one presently serving in the House has voted "No" more frequently and consistently than Iowa's Harold Royce Gross.

"It doesn't bother me one bit to be a minority of one when I'm convinced I'm right," Gross said in an interview in his office as he puffed alternately on a pipe and cigarettes.

Gross is a rarity among politicians in that he has nothing but scorn for the late Speaker Sam Rayburn's formula for succeeding in Congress: "To get along, go along." To Gross, compromise is a dirty word.

As an uncompromising loner Gross's successes are infrequent. Yet he is widely credited with saving millions of taxpayers' dollars by exposing sloppily drafted spending proposals.

Had Gross had his way since he came to Washington, the federal government and its bureaucracy would have shrunk back to pretty much what they were in the Calvin Coolidge Administration.

There would have been no space program, no federal aid to anyone except maybe farmers and no civil rights legislation.

The United States would not be a member of the United Nations and Gross and all other members of Congress would be receiving the \$12,500 a year they did in 1949 instead of the current salary of \$42,500. Gross has opposed every pay increase.

About the only appropriation bills he normally supports are those for defense—those because "I would prefer to make an error on the side of what I conceive to be national security."

Since Gross, as a matter of principle, supports little that Congress does, his role in the House is essentially that of a sentinel or watchdog, on the lookout for wasteful spending or legislative gimmicks designed to help a special interest.

There is general agreement he performs a vital service. "If we didn't have an H. R. Gross we'd have to invent him," said Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.).

When something in a bill arouses his suspicions, Gross rises from his center aisle seat and challenges the bill's sponsors:

"Who dreamed up this boondoggle? Just what's in this turkey?"

When the House is in session Gross is constantly on hand lest someone try to slip a fast one past the American taxpayer. And always he cultivates the impression of being a terrible tempered curmudgeon.

Despite droopy eyelids, he has a penetrating stare. He usually scowls, as if weaned on a sour pickle, and his deep, raspy voice emits words etched in acid.

"His satire is caustic," said Rep. Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.), who sits with Gross on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. "When the Administration people present their foreign aid bills I'm told they take a nerve pill before they come up to face H.R."

There is nothing that arouses Gross's bile like foreign aid. He has never voted for a foreign aid bill and the politer term he has for foreign aid is "money down the rathole giveaway program." For indulging in foreign aid, the United States is "Uncle Sap," "Uncle Sucker" or "Uncle Sugar."

As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Gross is one of the more eligible members of the House for taxpayer-financed overseas inspection trips so popular with other committee members. But he denounces such trips as junkets and has rejected all invitations to join them.

In fact, Gross has not been out of the United States since he was shipped to France in 1917 as a World War I artilleryman after dropping out of high school and lying about his age to qualify for Army enlistment.

Gross once got into an acrimonious debate with a committee colleague, Rep. Wayne L. Hays (D-Ohio), a frequent overseas visitor who came under fire a few years ago for taking the headwaiter of the House restaurant to Paris with him at the taxpayers' expense.

Gross was opposing a bill backed by Hays to raise federal salaries and Hays became so exasperated he exclaimed, "The gentleman

reminds me of the queen who said, 'Me-thinks he doth protest too much.'"

"Is that the queen the gentleman has met on one of his innumerable junkets overseas?" Gross retorted.

More than once Gross has used wit and sarcasm to scuttle a bill that had appeal for House colleagues.

In 1961, then Rep. John F. Shelley (D-Calif.) took a bill to the floor to authorize a special flag for House members to be flown on their automobiles or ships.

"Ships?" Gross asked incredulously.

Shelley explained that he had been boating near the mouth of the Potomac "one dark and stormy night" and when he had tried to seek haven near a military reservation a sentry had fired a shot at his boat.

Declaring the incident might have been avoided had he had a congressional flag, Shelley said:

"We let the Executive Department provide flags down to the assistant secretaries. Under every rule of protocol we outrank them and we should have our own flag."

Gross was not persuaded. Raising the possibility of trigger-happy sentries, Gross asked:

"What happens to the poor devil who doesn't have a flag? Do they just go ahead and shoot him?" As for putting a flag on an automobile, Gross asked, "Where are you going to fly these flags—above or below the count?"

The flag bill was defeated, 270 to 108.

Gross often infuriates his colleagues with his penchant for delaying tactics.

Few share his conviction that duty requires constant attendance on the House floor. Doing so can be tedious and boring and most members contend their time is more profitably spent in committee meetings, in their office answering mail or even relaxing.

Their absence gives Gross an opportunity to delay legislation he opposes.

As a matter of House rules and precedents, he seizes on any parliamentary device that will help his cause. His favorite is the quorum call.

For the House to conduct business, the rules require the presence of a quorum, or a majority of the 435 members. Often the absence of a quorum is simply ignored and business is conducted anyway. But not if Gross can help it.

Since a quorum seldom is on hand, Gross merely has to make a point of order to set the quorum call bells clanging and forcing absent members to come trooping to the floor, frequently cursing.

How else can you make a point? Gross asks in defense of his practice. "The point is that I think they ought to be on the House floor. I don't know whether they're in their offices or playing golf or in the gymnasium or in the swimming pool."

Like many Iowans who come from the soil, Gross has an ascetic appearance. With his glasses, his thinning hair and spare features he could have been the model for the farm husband in Grant Wood's classic painting "American Gothic."

Gross was born on a farm near Arispe, Iowa, in 1899 and was a high school dropout. After his Army stint in World War I he studied journalism at the University of Missouri but did not receive a degree.

Before his election to Congress in 1948, Gross worked for several newspapers and United Press, now United Press International, then drifted into radio newscasting on station WHO in Des Moines. The man who introduced his newscasts was a sports announcer named Ronald Reagan, now the governor of California.

"Reagan was a Democrat then," Gross said, but they became good friends and have remained so to this day. In 1968, Gross backed Reagan in his unsuccessful contest against

Richard Nixon for the Republican presidential nomination.

Gross' first venture into politics was a failure. In 1940, he challenged Iowa's Gov. George A. Wilson, who was seeking a second term, in the Republican primary and lost by 16,000 votes.

Eight years later, in his first bid for Congress, Gross succeeded. He unseated his district's Republican incumbent in the primary and was elected by a 20,000-vote margin in November.

Since 1948, he has been repeatedly reelected by comfortable margins with but one exception. That was in 1964, the year of the Goldwater debacle. Before the election, Republicans held all but one of Iowa's seven congressional seats. Gross was the lone survivor in the '64 Democratic landslide and he won by a mere 419 votes. In 1972, Gross was reelected by 22,265 votes out of a total vote of 188,202.

In his private life, Gross fishes for relaxation and takes an occasional drink but he and his wife Hazel shun the Washington social scene.

"I've never owned a tuxedo and my wife has no ball gown," Gross is fond of saying. "We don't need them."

As a foe of government spending and an apostle of a balanced federal budget, Gross' ideology is best summarized in a bill he has futilely sponsored for 15 years.

The bill, in a play on his own name, always carries the number H.R. (House of Representatives) 144 (the number of units in a gross). The bill would require the federal budget to be balanced except in times of war or national emergency and would earmark up to 5% of the government's net annual revenue for reduction of the national debt.

The bill is referred each year to the House Ways and Means Committee, where it is quickly forgotten.

"They've never even given me the courtesy of a hearing," Gross said recently, more in sorrow than rancor.

He is pessimistic about the country's future.

"No one in government is showing any disposition to hold down spending to the point that it would affect this awful inflation," he said.

"There is no fiscal or monetary discipline. And there will be a day of accounting. There is no way that this debt of almost \$500 billion can be retired by orderly means. I fear there can be a lethal result that will be the loss of our system of government. We are getting ripe for a demagogue."

Gross is also disturbed by "the serious erosion of morality in the country." And he is not particularly impressed with the Presidents he has known since he has been in Congress.

"I don't think we've had a really great President since I have been here," he said when asked which President he admired most.

"There were some things about Truman that I admired and some others that I didn't. He had his five per-centers and deepfreezers. Kennedy was out too soon to judge what he might have been."

"Eisenhower occupied the office. But he had no trouble getting rid of Sherman Adams when he got into trouble."

"The least I can say about Lyndon Johnson is the better."

"Nixon? As of now he'll be on the list of not very great Presidents. I'm very disappointed with him."

As for Watergate, Gross said, "I would have no difficulty voting for impeachment if there is clear, solid evidence the President committed a criminal act or engaged in a criminal conspiracy but the evidence has got to be solid."

OUR NATION SALUTES THE SQUIRRETTES OF MARY, OUR LADY OF MYSTICAL ROSE CIRCLETTE, ST. ANTHONY'S COLUMBIETTES, BUTLER, N.J.

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed my privilege and honor to call your attention to the founding of the Squirrellets of Mary, the first official youth development program of the Supreme Council of the Columbiettes to be established in the State of New Jersey, known as Our Lady of Mystical Rose Circlette.

This organization of Catholic young ladies between the ages of 13 and 18 years is sponsored by the St. Anthony's Columbiettes, auxiliary to the Knights of Columbus Council No. 943, Butler, N.J. Since the inaugural ceremonies on January 20, 1974, Our Lady of Mystical Rose Circlette has become a most viable Catholic action program for the young people in my congressional district providing a highly respected outlet for not only spiritual expression, but the cultural pursuits and recreational enjoyment of the young ladies of our community.

Mr. Speaker, may I commend to you and our colleagues here in the Congress the following young ladies and their advisers who comprised the charter membership of the Circlette. The roster of charter members, officers, and counselors is as follows:

CHARTER MEMBERS

Patricia Bannon, Linda Batvinskis, Ann Marie Borusiewicz, Joan Borusiewicz, Mary Ellen Crete, Maureen Dore, Kathleen Duffy, Deborah Faulhefer, Diane Feole, Linda Fiederbach, Maureen Forshay, Cynthia Harris, Diane Hoffman, and Deborah Kahn.

Patricia Kelly, Brenda Kochka, Linda Kochka, Teresa Morse, Carol Pagano, Karen Peterson, Lynn Peterson, Denise Quigley, Susan Rappolla, Donna Rickelmann, Mary Ricker, Barbara Rizzuto, Kathy Scarna, Kathleen Treweeke, and Anne Marie Walek.

CHARTER OFFICERS

Mrs. Jean Roberts, Chairman.
Kathleen Treweeke, President.
Anne Marie Borusiewicz, Vice President.
Anne Marie Walek, Secretary.
Patricia Kelly, Treasurer.
Cynthia Harris, Chancellor.
Kathleen Duffy, Trustee.
Linda Batvinskis, Trustee.
Deborah Faulhefer, Marshall.
Linda Kochka, Marshall.

CHARTER COUNSELORS

Mrs. Joan Taggart, Chief Counselor.
Mrs. Ann Tancott, Catholic Action.
Mrs. Phyl Ramiccio, Catholic Action.
Miss Liz Soland, Cultural.
Mrs. Camille Walek, Athletic.
Mrs. Ann Kelly, Athletic.
Mrs. Lillian Borusiewicz, Social.
Mrs. Jean Roberts, Social.

On July 7, 1974, the new officers and counselors of Our Lady of Mystical Rose Circlette will be installed, as follows:

OFFICERS

Mrs. Jean Roberts, Chairman.
Kathleen Treweeke, President.
Cynthia Harris, Vice President.

Anne Marie Walek, Secretary.
 Patricia Kelly, Treasurer.
 Maureen Dore, Chancellor.
 Kathleen Duffy, Trustee.
 Mary Ellen Crete, Trustee.
 Deborah Faulhefer, Marshall.
 Joan Borusiewicz, Marshall.

COUNSELORS

Mrs. Joan Taggart, Chief Counselor.
 Mrs. Jean Roberts, Social.
 Mrs. Lillian Borusiewicz, Social.
 Miss Liz Seiland, Cultural.
 Mrs. Ann Kelly, Athletic.
 Mrs. Camille Walek, Athletic.
 Mrs. Ann Tancott, Catholic Action.
 Mrs. Phyl Ramleio, Catholic Action.

Mr. Speaker, I know you will agree with me that the communion of people and particularly the forum afforded to our young ladies during these most formative developmental years of maturity to young womanhood is of inestimable value and a most important investment in the future of America.

The Squirettes of Mary originated many years ago through the diligence and inspirational leadership of Rev. Michael Keene, Father Prior of the Immaculate Conception Circle of Columbian Squires in Colton, Calif., and the first Squirettes of Mary was established in Colton, Calif., under his direction. The Squirettes elect their own officers and each girl serves on one of the committees: First, Catholic action; second, cultural; third, social; or fourth, athletic activities. Each Circle is sponsored by an exemplary and organized Catholic women's organization which appoints the chief counselor and counselors for each activity. The counselors direct the programing for the Squirettes, but are responsible to the sponsoring organization at all times for the welfare and progress of the Squirette Circle. A chaplain is also designated as adviser to the membership.

The Squirettes organizational program is continuing to grow internationally and is expanding its membership throughout the world. At the present time, in addition to the establishment of Circles in many of our States, Puerto Rico, Canada, Mexico, and the Philippines have adopted and organized Catholic young ladies programs within its charter.

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to not only commend the young ladies of Our Lady of Mystical Rose Circle for their zeal and sincerity of purpose in organizing under this goodwill emblem of faith, hope, and charity, but I know you will also want to join with me in saluting the Squirettes of Mary, St. Anthony's Columbiettes, the Knights of Columbus Council, the priests, and residents of my district for the success of this outstanding youth program and their continued good works in ever-seeking quality in our way of life for the spiritual and cultural enrichment of our community, State, and Nation.

IMPEACHMENT IN AMERICAN HISTORY

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the attempt to impeach a president is indeed a traumatic experience for a nation and for a people. Some, however, think of it as totally unique to the present occupant of the White House. The fact is, of course, that in the years gone by the impeachment process has been threatened and instigated against many of America's great presidents. In addition to the best known presidents, such as Washington and Lincoln, many lesser ones have had impeachment resolutions introduced against them and pursued, including Herbert Hoover.

I think it is important to put our present situation in perspective and to obtain a balanced judgment. It is particularly important that we understand what has gone on in history in regard to Presidents George Washington, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Andrew Johnson and others.

A recent article entitled "Impeachment in American History", by John Sutherland Bonnell, makes this point quite well and I would like to read it into the RECORD. It follows:

IMPEACHMENT IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By John Sutherland Bonnell)

(NOTE.—Dr. Bonnell is author of "Presidential Profiles", published by Westminster Press, based on the lives of thirty-six presidents of the United States. He served for twenty-seven years as senior minister of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. He was educated in universities and seminaries in Canada, England and New York. He has been the recipient of ten honorary doctorates and has authored twelve books. On retirement Dr. Bonnell became President for three years of the New York Theological Seminary and is now actively engaged in lecturing and writing.)

"Impeachment" is the word. It is now on everybody's tongue. Many Americans regard impeachment as a simple and convenient means of getting rid of an unwanted National leader. They appear to be oblivious of the traumatic effect such an event would have on the American people and indeed also on nations friendly to us. President James Buchanan asserted that, "It would be an imposing spectacle for the world."

Americans right now should be doing their history homework, so that we may become better informed on the presidential crises of the past and discover how they were resolved. We need an informed perspective in order to see current events in their relative importance.

WASHINGTON—THE FIRST TO BE THREATENED

It may come as a surprise to some to learn that our first President, George Washington, was threatened with impeachment by political enemies. The charge against him was "A daring infringement of our Constitutional rights." It arose when the Jay Treaty was concluded with Great Britain in 1794.

William Roscoe Thayer, a biographer of Washington, declares that a bitter struggle was precipitated when the President's opponents in Congress demanded that he hand over the correspondence and exchanges that

led up to the signing of the Jay Treaty. This George Washington resolutely refused to do, even though he had neither precedent nor legal landmark to guide him. Dr. Thayer remarks that Washington clearly foresaw the danger of such a concession to his own administration and also the likelihood that it would be used against his successors in the Presidential office.

During and after confrontation with his antagonists Washington was deeply hurt by assaults not only on his capacity to govern but also on his character and honor. He wrote, "Every act of my administration has been attacked in such exaggerated and indecent terms as could scarcely be applied to a Nero—or even to a common pickpocket." George Washington was undeniably "first in war" . . . but several decades had to pass before he was "first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Andrew Jackson was swept into the Presidency on his reputation as a military commander and by a hero's role in the war of 1812. Yet even before his election, as soon as he became involved in public life, he was deeply hurt by continuous onslaughts on his character and the aspersions upon the virtue of his beloved wife Rachel. Jackson in office manifested something of the inner strength and determination of Abraham Lincoln. These qualities he demonstrated by preserving the Union when it was dangerously threatened in March 1833.

During a fierce controversy over chartering the Bank of the United States, Congress passed several resolutions extolling the Bank and censuring the President. His political foes employed censure, which has been called a "soft impeachment," only because they could not muster sufficient votes to impeach him. Strangely enough, long before he had entertained the remotest hope of himself becoming President, young Andrew Jackson had demanded that George Washington should be impeached.

Senator Calhoun, in a violent speech on the floor of the Senate, said that Jackson's "bank deprivations" were "adding robbery to murder." Later the President reported that he had received five hundred letters from people threatening to kill him. Indeed he escaped death only because a would-be assassin's two pistols both misfired. Tested later by the police, both fired perfectly. Professor Sidney Hyman commenting on these happenings, writes, "In the final pathological stages of the efforts, (personal) attacks of this sort have led directly to the death of three presidents and to attacks on others." President Jackson retired from office more popular than when he was first elected.

Louis Brownlow in "The President and the Presidency" writes "Every President when he has been in office, has been denounced as a despot, a tyrant, a dictator, as one who was using the power of the Government to achieve his personal ambitions. The only President who was not so denounced was William Henry Harrison; he lived only one month after he was inaugurated."

Almost identical language is used on this subject by Marcus D. Cunliffe and Sidney Hyman, the latter described by historians as an "expert on the Presidency."

IMPEACHMENT OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN
PLANNED

Abraham Lincoln who was President of the United States during the most critical years of this nation's history, came threateningly close to impeachment in the winter of 1862-1863. Secret meetings were held in Washington to lay plans for launching an impeachment. Radical Republicans with reactionaries of both parties wanted a man in the Presidency more obedient to their wishes.

Early in the summer of 1865 Lincoln's rating sank to its lowest point, even among a

large proportion of prominent citizens. Richard Dana, author of "Two Years Before the Mast," wrote to Charles Francis Adams, who was American Minister to London at that time, "The most striking thing in Washington is the lack of personal loyalty to the President. It does not exist. He has no admirers, no enthusiastic supporters, none to bet on his head." Dana added that Lincoln was "a good Western jury lawyer but he is an unutterable calamity today where he is."

Carl Sandburg comments, "For weeks the denunciation flowed on mixed with clamor and sniping criticism. Albert G. Riddle (Republican of Ohio) said that, 'The just limit of manly debate had been brutally outraged.' The press had caught up and reechoed the clamor."

The impeachment scheme failed but the more merciful assassin's bullet succeeded. America had gotten rid of Abraham Lincoln.

THE TRIAL OF ANDREW JOHNSON

The classic illustration of what American presidents, while in office, have had to endure and which is most pertinent to our time, is the almost successful impeachment and conviction of President Lincoln's successor, Andrew Johnson. . . . His efforts to put into effect the more generous policies that Lincoln had advocated with respect to the South and other controversial matters brought him into sharp conflict with members of both the House and the Senate. Everything came to a head when he dismissed Secretary of War Edwin Stanton who not only opposed the President but secretly acted as an informant for his bitterest opponents. Congress had just passed a law designed to block such an action by an American President and re-installed Stanton.

President Johnson in his defense claimed that his viewpoint would have been supported by every President from Washington to his own day. And he was right if John Adams' position was typical of other former presidents. Long before the Johnson issue had arisen President Adams during a heated discussion remarked "if the President of the United States has not enough authority to change his own secretaries, he is no longer fit for his office."

If President Johnson had meekly accepted such a law as Congress had proposed it would have broken down the Madisonian concept of "checks and balances" in the interrelationship of the President and the Congress. The uniquely important office of the Presidency would have been degraded into some kind of political secretariat that could readily be made the tool of designing politicians.

Many Americans are clamoring today inside and outside of Congress for the impeachment of President Nixon as though it were a simple matter to accomplish with clear-cut procedures and would entail a minimum disturbance to either our national life or the structure of American government. They should read the story of the whole sordid business of the impeachment by the House of Representatives and attempted conviction by the Senate of President Andrew Johnson.

Dr. Ronis W. Konig, author of "The Chief Executive" states that President Johnson's trial by the Senate was presided over by a Chief Justice "who wanted to be president; having a craving for the office that Lincoln once likened to insanity." In line of succession was the "president protomorphe" of the Senate whom the author describes as "vulgar and vituperative." The trial lasted eleven and a half weeks. One thousand tickets were printed valid for one day and "furiously competed for." The galleries were crowded with the senators, their wives and daughters, "blooming with finery"—scores of reporters and distinguished visitors from other countries attended.

The "radicals" secured an adjournment for

ten days, despite the objection of the Chief Justice, to line up every possible vote against the President. The prosecutor at the trial before the Senate called President Johnson: "a traitor, a tyrant, a usurper and an apostate."

The attempt at conviction failed by one vote.

"The one heroic figure to emerge from the contemptible proceedings was Senator Edward G. Ross, a soldier and journalist of Kansas, who voted 'No.' He withstood incredible pressure with soldierly firmness even though, to use his own words, 'friends, position and fortune were ready to be swept away' and he stood 'looking into his own grave.'"

By this heroic act, our system of American Government with its delicate balance of responsibility between the legislative and executive branches, fashioned with pains-taking care through three-quarters of a century, was preserved. A fearsome threat to representative democracy in America went down to defeat by a single vote. If President Johnson had been successfully convicted, the door would have been left wide open for the dismissal of any President, on political rather than legal grounds. Professor Rexford G. Tugwell writes that the radicals in Congress were determined to reduce the Presidency to "ministerial status."

IMPEACHMENT—A MEGATON BOMB

The threat of impeachment and conviction has been likened to that of a megaton bomb—too frightening to contemplate except as a last and desperate expedient. Professor Clinton Rossiter regarded impeachment as "The extreme medicine of the Constitution, so brutally administered in the one instance in which it was prescribed as to provoke a revulsion." President Jefferson could not even envision a situation where it might lawfully be used.

Despite the ominous words of Professor Rossiter and the skepticism of President Jefferson the fact remains that impeachment is still an integral part of the Constitution of the United States. How then do we account for the fact that no President of the United States has been impeached and convicted in almost two hundred years of our Nation's history, in spite of several abortive attempts to apply impeachment and one unsuccessful effort to obtain conviction. One reason undoubtedly is because of the dire penalties entailed. These are set forth in the Articles of the American Constitution: Article I, Section 3(7) which reads in part: "removal from Office, disqualification to hold and enjoy any Office of honor, Trust or Profit under the United States;" "But the Party convicted shall nevertheless be liable and subject to Indictment, Trial, Judgment and Punishment, according to Law."

If the convicted President should happen to be a family man, the pall of disgrace would fall not only on himself but on his wife, his children and his grandchildren "to the third and fourth generation." It might well cut him off completely from the sources of livelihood for which he has spent the greater part of his lifetime in preparation. And who will aver that the Nation that elected him will not itself be on trial before the eyes of the whole world?

HUMANITARIAN SERVICE PERFORMED BY ARMED SERVICES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, earlier last month a rescue mission sup-

ported by the Air Force, Navy, and Coast Guard saved the lives of two badly injured tuna fishermen from my district in San Diego where America's tuna fleet is based.

This is not the first time the military has responded to the call for help. I want to take this time to congratulate the services for these humanitarian efforts on behalf of our civilian community. More and more we see that the Services are becoming better integrated with civilian counterparts not only in rescue missions but also by helping out in communities stricken by natural disaster.

A story about this rescue was carried in the San Diego Union which I ask to be reprinted at this point. I am sure it will be of interest to our colleagues:

[From the San Diego Union, June 12, 1974]

AIR FORCE RESCUING TWO FISHERMEN

(By KEN HUDSON)

An 800-mile, 15-hour rescue mission to return two severely injured tuna fishermen to San Diego was under way last night by the Navy, Air Force and Coast Guard.

An Air Force helicopter, which was to be refueled five times at sea by a team of two tanker planes, was bringing the men from the tunaboat Proud Heritage to San Diego where they could be treated.

The men, Antonio C. Rodriguez, 52, and Mario Da Silva, 33, were injured when the pursuing cable on the tunaboat's net "let go" Sunday afternoon. It was not known which man received which injury.

Two medically trained Air Force parachute jumpers made a Sunday night jump into the rain-swept ocean and were picked up by the tunaboat's crew to treat the men.

A Navy surgeon, Lt. Cmdr. Donald A. Vance of the North Island Naval Air Station, was aboard the Air Force helicopter that rendezvoused with the Proud Heritage yesterday afternoon to pick up the injured men.

The helicopter was expected to arrive in San Diego early this morning. Aerial refueling was necessary because of the long distances involved. One of the tankers was from Hickam Air Force Base in Hawaii and the other from McClelland AFB at Sacramento.

REMARKS OF SECRETARY MORTON BEFORE NORTHWEST PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter into the Record Secretary Morton's remarks before the Northwest Public Power Association meeting held in Anchorage on June 29.

The following is an excellent account of the role the Pacific Northwest will play in achieving energy self-sufficiency for the United States:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR ROGERS C. B. MORTON

At a time when the focus of the Nation's attention is on energy self-sufficiency, it is a pleasure to be here in a State that is destined to play a major role in achieving this objective.

It is an even greater pleasure to meet with people who are ahead of the game in solving their energy problems, especially those of future electric power supply. Don Hodel has been keeping me posted on the progress being

made in the Pacific Northwest with the fine cooperation he has received from your Association.

I commend you for your spirit and your attitude in—

Meeting the challenges of building needed generation;

Supporting BPA's transmission construction and financing programs;

Facing up to the need for higher rate levels; and

In helping to make these programs equitable.

I know that Don and Jim House will be reporting to you tomorrow for both BPA and Alaska Power Administration on the power supply picture and other matters pertinent to their responsibilities.

I think it might be of interest if I talked about some of the things the Administration and the Department of the Interior are doing to restore our national energy balance to a sound basis.

The objective, as announced by President Nixon, is to restore our capability to supply all our essential energy needs, and do it as soon as possible. You will recognize this effort as Project Independence.

To get from here to there, the President called for a number of programs to be undertaken, which add up to a strategy that encompasses four distinct lines of action.

First, it is our intention and objective to conserve as much energy as possible, to get our rate of annual increase in demand for energy down to something we can live with over the long-term.

Second, we will push hard on our current and ongoing sources of domestic energy supply—oil, gas, solid coal, hydro and pumped storage, and conventional nuclear plants—as the quickest way to expand energy supply over the next several years.

Third, we are beginning a very large program of energy research and development aimed at shifting our main reliance from conventional oil and gas to the more plentiful sources. These would be clean fuels from coal and the breeder nuclear reactor in the intermediate term, and eventually such exotic sources as solar and nuclear fusion over the long-term.

Finally, imports. We will import oil and gas—as they may be available—during this interim period to make up the balance between the amount of energy we can produce and what we actually need. The more successful we are in increasing domestic supply and in reducing demand, the more quickly our level of imports will drop.

I don't contend here that we are going to phase out oil and gas imports completely. But we want protection from the possibility of cutoffs and we want an option of trading or not trading in energy according to the advantage it offers us.

I'd like now to address a few additional remarks to conservation.

For a very long period in our history, we got along perfectly well with an average annual increase of about 3 percent in our energy consumption. Then, the growth rate suddenly jumped during the latter half of the 1960's to around 5 percent a year. Last year the increase was 4.8 percent.

Now, if we were to go on increasing our energy consumption at 5 percent a year, and at the same time make ourselves self-sufficient in energy, we would have to more than double our production of energy by 1985, and that's not a manageable figure.

If we drop the increase rate back to 3 percent, we would only have to increase energy production by two-thirds, and that's manageable.

So the first thing we have to understand about Project Independence is that it is workable only in the context of a very substantial reduction in energy growth rates that we have come to regard as normal.

As a result of our recent experiences we are beginning to see conservation as a practical, realizable goal.

For a long time the conventional wisdom was that you just couldn't do anything to slow the rate of energy growth without something awful happening to the economy. Then along came adversity and we learned that we could do this impossible thing of reducing our energy consumption.

And nobody proved it any more effectively than the people of the Northwest and the utilities that served them.

I'm told that you started the Fall period with a prospective power supply deficit of 7.5 percent and this is what you asked your customers to save—as a minimum—when you instituted your conservation programs last August.

By November your savings were running as high as 10.8 percent when adjusted for temperature.

Then the rains came and the critical phase ended. But the remarkable thing apparently has been that once they got into the habit, people went right on saving electricity.

I'm told that April usage was 4 percent below estimates, even though the urgency of the shortage last Fall was past. I sincerely hope that this pattern of restraint continues.

What the Northwest has had is a reprieve, not a pardon. The long range energy supply problems are still there.

I congratulate you on what you have achieved thus far, and I urge you to continue an aggressive program of energy conservation.

Next, stimulation of conventional domestic energy sources.

We currently produce 600 million tons of coal, 4 billion barrels of oil, and 22 trillion cubic feet of gas a year. These are enormous amounts.

Time is of the essence, and it will be quicker to get sizeable increases in energy production from ongoing industries than it will be to build completely new industries to process oil and gas from coal and oil shale.

We'll have to do both, but it's a matter of timing. We reach the payoff from conventional sources first.

Hopefully, we'll begin to reach payoff on the North Slope by the latter part of 1977 with the completion of the transport link between it and the West Coast.

The biggest and the earliest single increment to new energy supply for the Nation is this two million barrels of oil a day we'll be getting from the North Slope by 1980.

More than that, once the pipeline construction gets under way in earnest, I look for a great renewal of exploration in this region which may in turn yield large new discoveries of oil and gas.

Getting gas from the North Slope to the United States will take longer.

We just received the first application for a right of way for a gas line last January. We expect others, and much additional work remains to be done before any construction can begin on whatever proposal is successful.

But gas from the Arctic is just as certain as oil. It is only a matter of working out problems that are now familiar to us.

The other major new prospective source of oil and gas is the Outer Continental Shelf. Our leasing goal for 1974 is 2½ million acres—two and a half times the average acreage of the past two years.

Our target for 1975 is 10 million acres—almost exactly what we have leased so far in the 20-year history of the OCS leasing program. The results from the accelerated program should begin to be available in the marketplace within three to four years.

The Alaskan areas of the Outer Continental Shelf are certain to come in for a careful

review as we expand the acreage offered for leasing.

They comprise nearly three-fourths of the total OCS area under U.S. jurisdiction out to the 200-meter depth curve. Moreover, the Gulf of Alaska is ranked by a number of petroleum companies as having the greatest potential of all the OCS areas.

That's the good news. The bad news is that the industry also considers the Alaskan areas to be environmentally the most hazardous of all those on the U.S. OCS, with the Gulf of Alaska ranking next to the highest in risk.

So it is going to take time and a lot of effort to resolve these tough questions which involve the balancing off of resource potential with environmental cost.

We are going ahead with our own study of the environmental impact of leasing 10 million acres in 1975, which is separate and apart from the one recently completed by the Council on Environmental Quality on the Atlantic Coast and the Gulf of Alaska.

In addition, we shall also prepare an environmental impact statement in advance of each lease sale, just as we are now doing. In no case will we offer acreage anywhere unless our studies show that it is environmentally acceptable to do so.

The use of solid coal is going to expand, and in fact it has been rapidly expanding in those areas where utilities can burn it under the existing emission standards. Coal consumption by utilities has increased by 19 percent just in the past two years.

The unavailability of gas and the high price of oil have stimulated a great interest in coal, especially the low-sulfur coals of the West.

But the fact remains that we are going to have to find a way to utilize the vast supplies of coal which are close to market but presently environmentally unacceptable.

This means long-range research and development, and coal programs comprise more than a third of the President's \$10 billion five-year energy research and development program.

Nearly \$400 million is being requested for coal research in the coming fiscal year. Most of this money is ticketed for programs aimed at making coal into an environmentally acceptable fuel.

To be more specific in your particular area of interest:

As you know, the President, in Project Independence, placed emphasis on hydroelectric development for power generation and the Federal Power Commission is presently seeking to identify the potential for remaining development.

In the Pacific Northwest you have 19 identified potential projects of over 200,000 kilowatt size that are not yet scheduled or under construction. The feasibility of building these projects—financial, engineering and especially environmental—is under investigation.

The projects total 17.5 million kilowatts, almost as much power as the Federal Columbia River Power System.

The problem is that environmental balance will likely preclude development of most of the base load projects among the 19.

This does not change the fact that development of the peaking capacity at the existing dams on that list as well as the additional potential of the region for pumped storage peaking facilities is essential.

A Corps of Engineers report has identified 242 pumped storage sites in western Washington, western Oregon and along the Lower Columbia River. These sites represent a total peaking capacity potential of more than 650 million kilowatts.

Let me stress the word "potential."

This is an incredibly large figure—half again the total installed generating capacity of the United States. Obviously, most of it won't be developed for a variety of economic,

political, and environmental reasons. But even as little as five percent of it would be a tremendous addition.

Nine of these sites have been under active consideration or have received serious study in recent years.

While solving your region's electrical energy problems you cannot ignore the need for the additional peaking capacity over the next 20 years.

The efforts of the Pacific Northwest utilities to solve their own electric resource problems in concert is an example of the rest of the nation.

I needn't tell you that a nuclear plant in operation is worth quite a few on the drawing board. You must continue to press forward with your Hydro-Thermal Power Program Phase 2.

Time is of the essence, because even assuming that Project Independence does cut the lead time for nuclear plants to six or eight years, Phase 3 may be just around the corner.

A year ago the Department directed BPA to work with the utilities of the region and with its industrial customers to come up with a long-range plan to provide for an adequate power supply for the region while minimizing the demands upon the Federal Treasury. I am certain that the program that resulted from your efforts will accomplish both purposes.

The first purpose—an adequate power supply—may well have been accomplished in any case—though at somewhat greater cost to the power users of the region.

Your efforts in solving the second purpose may prove to be an even more significant step in achieving that adequate power supply.

It is true that the Federal Government has been a committed partner to the Hydro-Thermal Power Program since 1969. But it is also true that the Federal commitment to that program is but one of many meritorious programs competing for Federal funds.

Even though the Federal Columbia River Power System is self-liquidating, the BPA and the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation must still line up with other Federal agencies to obtain a share of the Federal budget.

Hearings were held earlier this month on the legislation to make the transmission portion of the Federal Columbia River Power System self-financing.

I am confident that when that legislation is enacted your programs in the region will get a double boost.

One will come, of course, in making it possible for BPA to maintain its construction program in a business like manner.

The other that could result from easing of pressures on the Federal budget, is likely to be a gain in funding of Federal generation in the region.

You have other pluses.

The far-sightedness that created the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest Intertie is to your credit. Along with your own conservation program, power imports helped you through the power crisis in the fall of 1973.

Then the Intertie turned around and saved millions of barrels of oil for the utilities of the Southwest during the winter of 1974. Not even the far-sighted planners of the early sixties contemplated such a crisis or the service the Intertie would perform in helping to solve it.

But your greatest accomplishment may yet go down as your conservation effort last fall which I mentioned earlier. Without the success of that effort there is little doubt that there would have been far greater damage to the economy of the region and greater suffering among the citizens than what was actually sustained.

While proving that conservation can work, the experience taught some hard lessons. You now have the job of reassessing for your-

selves and your consumers the rate structures that will continue good electrical service at reasonable, though higher, costs.

In closing, I return to an earlier theme. Conservation is going to have to become a way of life for all of us. For years, cheap and abundant energy fueled the economic growth of your region as it did the United States as a whole. We have never had to think very much about the cost of energy.

Now we know that energy conservation belongs in our business and our domestic budgets in the same category with labor, materials, and food, clothing and shelter.

The spirit of community and the great self-reliance of the citizens of the Pacific Northwest must have been the kinds of things Abraham Lincoln had in mind when he said, "the legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot do so well for themselves."

Providing the energy the nation needs for economic strength is the great challenge of the last half of the 20th Century.

Pacific Northwest utilities have outlined programs that will maintain a dynamic economy for the region while preserving those things which make all of you glad you live there and make a lot of the rest of us wish we did.

It remains for you to make those programs work, and I have every confidence that you will. Again, my congratulations on what you have done in the past, and my best wishes for success in the future.

MCKINNEY SUPPORTS JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT OF 1974

HON. STEWART B. MCKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 1, 1974

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, despite the efforts of existing Federal programs, we have seen in this country an appalling rise in the rate of juvenile delinquency, defined both as criminal and noncriminal activity. Perhaps the most shocking statistic is the rise in arrests for criminal activities among youths under the age of 18 at a rate of 124.5 percent in the last decade. And this despite the enactment of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 and its replacement, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968. This is truly a searing comment on the need for coordinated Federal, State, and local efforts to prevent delinquency which H.R. 15276, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 provides.

The emphasis of this bill is on the local community where the problems of youth must be confronted most directly. The formula approach for grants to the States assures that each State will receive funds according to its own particular need and in addition encourages further coordination of efforts on the State level. I am encouraged by the inclusion of a discretionary Federal fund for the development of new approaches and techniques in dealing with disturbed youth and community-based alternatives to traditional forms of delinquency prevention.

I am particularly pleased by the in-

clusion of the Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice within H.R. 15276. I had the privilege of cosponsoring separate legislation along these lines with our colleague, Hon. TOM RAILSBACK, earlier in this Congress. I feel that this section will make it possible to gather the information and statistics needed to evaluate programs sponsored by this legislation. In light of the fact that there is not precise data available as to the overall budget outlays for delinquency prevention, the need for the compilation of such information seems self-apparent. The Institute's evaluation of delinquency prevention programs is no less important than providing the funds for the programs in the first place. This is especially true in a time when the Congress must weigh the inflationary impact of any added Federal spending. The problem with too many federally funded programs is that there is no evaluation process available to the Government to insure that the moneys being spent are effective in realizing the goals of the programs. The Institute provides the means for accomplishing this end.

Another innovation the Institute provides is short term training, workshops, and seminars for those working with youth in the local community in the latest effective techniques for dealing with disturbed and delinquent young people. The Institute would also develop technical training teams which can be sent out to State and local agencies to work directly with youth. Hopefully these teams will be able to aid local communities by adding insights and skills which might not ordinarily be available to them. Finally, establishment of the Institute provides a focal point for the widely divergent groups who will be involved in the administration of this legislation, and as such contribute to the elimination of the fragmentation which now exists in the field of juvenile delinquency.

The members of the Committee of Education and Labor are to be commended for their recognition of the merit of the Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice and the contribution which the Institute makes to the successful administration of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act. The support for this provision, especially for the training of professionals and nonprofessionals in this field is broad-based, extending from law enforcement agencies to social service organizations.

When I first came to Congress, drug-related crimes among young people had reached what appeared to be epidemic proportions. In our efforts to deal with this problem, we focused on prevention of drug abuse and drug-related crimes by establishing programs to deal with it as a health and social problem. I believe we have made real progress with this approach in this area.

With this bill, we tackle the attendant problem of youth, juvenile delinquency. In the last session of this Congress, the House passed similar legislation to this, but in the last rush toward adjournment, the Senate failed to act on it. It appears that we will not repeat that mistake.

One of the most disturbing aspects of

this problem is the high rate of recidivism. It has been established that 72 percent of youthful offenders return to prison within 5 years of their first offense. In our present penal system, it is not too difficult to include that meaningful rehabilitation, as illustrated by the above statistic, has been almost nonexistent. Our efforts then with this legislation are to prevent the juvenile from reaching what unfortunately has become the end of the road, incarceration. As Brother Al Behm of the Glenmary Home Missionaries, a constituent who is deeply involved in youth work in Fairfield, Conn., wrote in a booklet for young people, "I've never met a bad one"; they are perhaps confused, alienated, but most in desperate need of help.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that with this legislation, emphasizing local control and coordinated with Federal efforts, we can reverse these tragic statistics. I strongly recommend my colleagues support for this legislation, not as money to be thrown at a problem, but as a responsible measure designed to curb what is becoming a national tragedy.

CITY PLANNING: WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to a thought-provoking article which appeared in the Washington Post, Saturday, June 29, on the subject of planning for the Nation's Capital City. The author raises several significant points regarding past planning in the District of Columbia, execution of the city's plan, and importantly, the challenge facing the planning authorities, as newly constituted under the home rule legislation: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: A PLAN GONE ASTRAY

(By Paul Thiry)

(Under home rule legislation that takes effect Monday, the D.C. Mayor's office becomes the central planning agency for the District, while the National Capital Planning Commission retains authority for "federal interest review." This is the first of two articles on planning for the Federal City.)

Washington, unique in its time as a city that was planned before it was constructed, is a place apart.

As physical manifestation of greatness, the U.S. Capitol was designed to surmount and command the scene of Washington and be visible from all directions. From within this Capitol would emanate the directives for the nation.

The city of Washington was conceived as an axial city: the Capitol on axis with the President's house and avenues radiating in all directions with reciprocal vistas to monuments, important buildings and distant spaces.

The principal buildings and monuments were to be identifiable and to stand in nobility. They were to be supported by the great avenues which were to be framed by dignified buildings, not in themselves great monuments but contributing to a total environment. Along the avenues and within bordering streets were to be the dwellings

of the inhabitants and, within compounds, markets and places for supporting commerce.

The plan for Washington was carefully designed to regard topography. It was developed with the idea that the surrounding hills would form a verdant frame for the entire city. The rivers were part of the plan, which led to the water's edge to an embankment running the full length of the waterfront from the southeast to Georgetown.

At the foot of the Capitol and central to all was the Mall, which was to be a great avenue flanked by the embassies of foreign governments. It terminated at the Washington Monument in a parklike, aquarian setting.

The plan, grand in scale, was simply conceived. The total concept was elegant and projected high principles in planning. It was and continues to be consistent with its lofty purpose.

But over the years, the plan of Washington has suffered various insults. Its axial streets and boulevards have been abruptly intercepted by buildings sited with complete disregard for vistas and accent.

Probably the most pugnacious of these interruptions is the Treasury, which terminates a vista intended from the Capitol to the White House along Pennsylvania Avenue. Some other intrusions: The Library of Congress blocks Pennsylvania Avenue to the southeast. The Rayburn Building eliminates passage via Delaware Avenue S.W., obliterating the view of the Capitol southwesterly. Union Station and the train yards terminate and void Delaware Avenue.

Practically all streets, axial or otherwise, southeast and southwest of the Capitol now encounter elevated freeways and truckage or drift into government compounds such as the Washington Navy Yard or Fort McNair. The center leg of the inner loop freeway, tunneled under the Mall, severs east-west streets between Constitution and New York Avenues N.W. In an attempt to correct this blunder, the new Department of Labor building was designed on air rights over the ditch; possibilities for further coverings and plazas to its north are being sought.

The Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium blocks East Capitol Street, an avenue which was conceived as a direct vista approach to the Capitol from the east and from across the Anacostia River.

The Eisenhower Civic Center, originally planned to relate to both sides of 8th Street N.W. with a vista from the National Collection of Fine Arts and Portrait Gallery to Mount Vernon Square, is now to occupy only the west side of 8th, leaving symmetry askew.

New Jersey Avenue NW—the street that led to the dismissal of L'Enfant as planner because he removed Commissioner Carroll's house out of its right-of-way—is threatened with closure.

The Grand Plaza of the Federal Triangle, a place destined as a garden setting for the classic buildings which surround it, is a parking lot for 1,300 automobiles.

Even the Mall has suffered its vicissitudes. It has been plowed, used to feed cattle, crisscrossed by railroad tracks, had its Tiber Creek filled, has been landscaped in various fashions and encroached upon by buildings, permanent and temporary. In 1962 the McMillan Commission reorganized its plan and brought the Mall into the place of honor it enjoyed until it became, along with the Grand Plaza, a parking lot for the government.

Public agencies started to move out, regardless of propriety or necessity, and upheaval in planning resulted. Roads and highways were indiscriminately superimposed on existing planned patterns. The result was channelling of traffic onto streets that were not designed to carry it, leaving local authorities the task of unraveling the problems which beset them, such as widenings, clos-

ings, vacations, land transfers, condemnation, realignments and relocations.

L'Enfant's plan has withstood 200 years of abuse, but it cannot absorb forever an unrelated system of cuts and fills, overpasses and underpasses, cloverleafs and access ramps and accompanying high speed traffic.

The disruption of the plan for Washington has been accompanied by disruption in the process of planning. Advocates of all persuasions present themselves for hearings in the public forum and make representation to a public which itself is in a magnificent state of confusion.

To simplify matters, they claim, the methods of planning must give way to "visionary, conversational processes; dynamic, not static; participatory, not elitist; profound, not superficial, but based on planning, programming, budgeting systems." Flexibility is seen as the key to all positive situations.

Advocacy planning has found its day and Washington, like most cities, has its share of "problem solvers." They descend upon the plan like hawks upon their prey. They answer to the litany of quantum and run the gamut of social, economic, statistical or political. Some specialize in humanizing influences. It is not always clear whether they foster humanity at its lowest or its highest denominator.

For certain, a most forceful advocate is the land accumulator, the developer/builder, who combines parcels of land, gets financing gets exception, gets tenants, leases, then sells out. He does no harm and may do some good if he adheres to city planning and restricts his activities to designated areas. More often he razes blocks of serviceable residences and jumps from place to place in chaotic rhythm, doing unmitigated damage. Even the most flexible plans are not sufficiently elastic to counter his thrusts.

There are those who advocate highrise office and apartment buildings, forgetting completely the precept of the Washington plan (that the Capitol dome should dominate the skyline) and its only hope for success. Combine freeways and highrise, and the entire concept of the capital city is destroyed.

The federal government exists in a confused state with reference to planning. Instead of continuing construction of its own buildings in Washington, it has deserted the southwest and south Capitol possibilities in favor of the builder-lessee or lease purchase principal. This does not exercise a sense of discipline nor, for that matter, any sense at all. Government offices appear in all areas of Washington as well as the suburbs.

Unfortunately, the Government absorbs the space provided regardless of where it is built. This fact encourages speculative building—a combination of marble lobby and maximum usable space. These builder projects relate to acquirable land but seldom relate to encroachment, compatibility or access to public transportation.

Rosslyn and Crystal City rise in the hinterland, and the crossfire of traffic moving out of Washington versus traffic moving into Washington imposes arterial lanes on the face of the land which under more thoughtful conditions would not be necessary.

The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away. Conversely, the government taketh away and the government giveth—through the Redevelopment Land Agency, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority and others. It takes property from one to bestow upon another. On the one hand, it encroaches on one area of the city to make way for renewal, redevelopment, truckage and highways and, on the other, too often reaches into another section of the city to offset and to seek correction for situations it created in the first place. No neighborhood is inviolate.

The core of Washington is given over to

RLA practically in its entirety. RLA sets the pattern for growth by planning individual renewal areas as units. These unit plans often are unrelated to each other or to the overall plan for the community as a whole. Often these plans fall before the proposals of whatever developers RLA can muster for the renewal areas. As a consequence, commercial uses of property spring up everywhere.

Today, the Pennsylvania Avenue development Corporation is delegated more or less full authority to plan development of the Avenue between the Capitol and Treasury. It now appears that this corporate body will deviate totally from the plan of the President's Council on Pennsylvania Avenue, a commission named by President John F. Kennedy and whose plan met with general acceptance by the American public and by the National Capital Planning Commission. The plan for Pennsylvania Avenue promised to give life to the avenue in a grand manner. Today, it appears that the corporation is working toward an Italian-type hill town and the informality of a country village instead of the image of a world capital.

The sprawl of office buildings within and without the District has left the older commercial areas of the city to decay. Central city decay is largely due to lack of 24-hour population. Sprawl has displaced residential structures in and around the central core and, consequently, people look for new places to move and in which to live. Constant disruption is axiomatic to the day. Unrest and social problems require still more changes and adjustments, disrupting the framework of neighborhoods and weakening the institutions that hold them together.

It is time to take a look at architecture as the vertical and outward manifestation of a plan. It is time to review what architecture means to society and to what degree it expresses a society.

The architecture of our forebears, with its classic and grand entrance ways, pointed to a cultural elevation of human kind. Today, we miss the fine distinction in detail. We only see gloomy brick and factory-like structures as a way of life.

Washington, like New York, has seen countless classic palatial buildings fall before the ball and the bulldozer to make way for questionable construction permitted under the technicalities of the zoning code. Much of the beauty created during the 100 years preceding World War II has disappeared and the nation's capital is none the richer for its loss.

Local planning as part of home rule is becoming a fact. Comprehensive planning for the nation's capital exceeds home rule, however. Planning for the capital of the U.S. should not be assigned to those whose interests may too often be vested in local scene and too often cannot see beyond these interests.

(Paul Thiry, a Seattle, Wash., architect is vice chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission. This article is excerpted from one which appeared in the AIA Journal.)

LEWIS DESCHLER'S RETIREMENT

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, Lewis Deschler's retirement after 50 years of service to the House of Representatives marks the end of an era. An era of the highest quality of parliamen-

tary procedure our legislative body has known.

Lew Deschler has distinguished himself as one of the finest public servants of the century. I personally regret that our association has been such a short one and I consider myself extremely fortunate to have served with such a man.

His wise counsel and unquestioned wisdom have guided this august body through 46 years, and his fine hand runs like an unbroken thread through the past four decades of our legislative history.

It is an honor to join in this tribute to Lew Deschler and I wish him good health, good fortune, and much happiness in the years ahead. We shall miss him.

DANGER IN FOREIGN TAKEOVERS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is discouraging, indeed, to note an attitude among my colleagues that says "What is the difference who owns an enterprise as long as it produces jobs?" in regard to the whole problem of foreign takeovers and ownerships of U.S. businesses. Not only does it smack of "I don't care-ism" but it borders on irresponsibility toward an important realm of economic policy.

Perhaps some of these people do not realize what is happening out there in the real world. It is sometimes pretty easy to lose contact. And so, for your edification, I present a little rollick of examples of the pervasiveness of this whole situation. Granted, this is just a taste of things. The whole story would curl your hair without a comb:

FOREIGN TAKEOVERS

Numerous other bills to restrict imported capital remain dormant in the House with little likelihood of revival this congressional session.

ANOTHER LOOK INTO INVESTING

The General Accounting Office (GAO), the independent audit arm of Congress, launches its own research effort into foreign investment situation in this country. Accountable only to Congress (not the Executive Branch), the agency audits Federal Departments and Agencies, as well as studies cost-effectiveness of Government programs. Many GAO research projects are requested by Congressmen or Committees, others are internally generated. According to GAO, their present study of imported capital is self-initiated. Results of the study may or may not be made public.

MORE ARAB ITEMS

Mid-East oil investments still have not surfaced in the US in the expected volume. These items, however, are reported:

Triad Holding Corp., a Luxembourg umbrella for Beirut-based Adnan Khashoggi, an Arab-born international financier with Saudi Royal Family connections, buys \$9 million in stock of Arizona-Colorado Land & Cattle Co. The Phoenix-based firm is an integrated agribusiness and natural resources holding-development company. Arizona-Colorado says Triad's involvement "is our company's first step toward agricultural development of the Arab nations."

A study by New Orleans-based R. L. Siegel & Assoc., a realty research firm, predicts \$2 billion from oil-rich Mid-East nations will flow here this year, mostly into real estate.

The bulk of the funds will buy apartment houses, retail properties, hotel and resort complexes in the East, Midwest and South. Siegel thinks few, if any of these projects will be developed or managed by the Mid-Easterners. "These offshore investors need the expertise of the American developer who can put the entire package together for them," he says.

An international realty investment syndicate controlled by Iranians has bought large Ozark land tracts along the Arkansas-Missouri border, according to a Rogers, Ark. realtor. The group now negotiates for 2100 acres of grazing land for investment purposes, not developments. The Persian investors are headed by an Iranian naturalized-US citizen living in Illinois.

An unidentified Kuwait buyer makes a multi-million-dollar offer for 15,500 acres of New Mexico rangeland according to *Previous Inc.*, the US realtors famed for international deals in luxury properties.

HEADLINER UPDATES

Communities all over the nation hope that they will be chosen as the site for the new Volkswagen plant, now that the long-stalled decision for a US facility has been made by the W. Germans. Michigan newspapers claim that state is a front runner. Ohio articles say the same things; as does St. Louis, Mo.; Davenport, Iowa; and Cobb County, Ga. Almost every state, plus hundreds of local industrial development groups approached VW over the years. At stake: a \$1.5 billion facility investment employing 10,000 workers.

NY's Franklin National Bank, 22% owned by Italian financier Michele Sindona, gets \$250 million support loan from eleven other NY banks in sustained rescue effort backed by Federal Reserve. Government feels Franklin is solvent (resources exceed liabilities), but suffering from cash flow problem triggered by \$39 million loss in mismanaged foreign exchange trading. Investigations multiply. More changes in bank's management foreseen. Takeover by larger bank likely answer to crisis. Meanwhile, due to huge customer withdrawals, Franklin slips from 20th to an estimated 36th ranking among nation's banks since mid-May when liquidity problems revealed. More to come.

Shareholders of Ronson Corp. of Woodbridge, N.J. won't know the outcome of the proxy fight to control their company by Liquifin AG of Liechtenstein for another two weeks. The proxy votes were impounded at Ronson's annual meeting June 13th and the results will be announced June 27th. Liquifin, subsidiary of Milan, Italy's Ligugis SpA, owns 36% of Ronson, but is attempting to elect six of the 7-member board. The year-long, bitterly contested takeover bid has many issues still to be settled. The biggest issue could be settled June 27th.

Swiss-based Accident & Casualty Insurance Co. of Winterthur finds takeover bid for Chicago's ailing \$4.6 billion CNA Financial Corp. turns into a 3-way corporate brawl with NY's Loews' Corp. CNA, which originally welcomed Winterthur offer, now fights any attempt for the Swiss firm to gain any more than 20% control. CNA also fights Loews' bid for 15% control. Many lawsuits filed, Illinois regulators, State Legislature also involved, even the SEC investigates. Outcome confused. More to come.

Certain-Teed Products Corp., a Pennsylvania building-materials maker, 35% owned by France's St. Gobain-Pont-a-Mousson, an industrial conglomerate, runs into financial problems because of mismanagement by a Certain-Teed subsidiary: Valley Forge Corp. Certain-Teed moves to protect itself, sets up a \$27 million reserve fund to write off losses by Valley Forge. Adding to Certain-Teed's troubles is the loss of its favorable financial rating on \$60 million of outstanding commercial paper by Moody's Investor Service.

NEW MANUFACTURING

Fukaishi Group of Japan opens US HQ in Atlanta, Ga., for planned \$20 million invest-

ment in mushroom growing operations that will ultimately be franchised. Fukalski also buys a 5-acre industrial site with building that will be expanded in nearby Griffin, Ga. where waste plastic recycling operations will soon start up.

Yamazaki Machinery Co., NY-based importing unit of Aichi, Japan's Yamazaki Tekkosho KK, maker of machine tools, builds a numerical control equipment assembly plant in Florence, Ky. near Cincinnati, which will employ 40.

Nissan Motor Co., producer of Datsun cars and trucks, builds its third US pickup truck assembly plant in Jacksonville, Fla. with a capacity for 24,000 units a year. The firm already makes 30,000 trucks yearly in Los Angeles and Seattle plants.

YKK Zipper Co., US unit of Tokyo's Yoshida Kogyo KK, one of the world's largest zipper and fastener makers, expands its Massachusetts' operations by moving into a new Marlboro manufacturing-distribution center from previous quarters in Natick.

Noritake Co., US unit of Nagoya, Japan's Nippon Toki KK, world famous porcelain-ware maker, joins with Thailand investors to manufacture ceramic substrates for electronic integrated circuits in Savannah, Ga. under the name Siam Electronics Ceramics Co.

Sekisui Products Inc., US unit of Osaka, Japan's Sekisui Kagaku Kogyo KK, plastic products producer, builds a polyethylene production plant in Linden, NJ.

Shell Chemical Co., Houston, Tex. unit of Royal Dutch-Shell, the joint Dutch-British international oil group, expands its Marietta, Ohio polystyrene plant to double production to 300 million pounds yearly.

TAKEOVERS

Sala International AB, Swedish mining and metallurgical equipment maker, buys Magnetic Engineering Assoc. Inc., Cambridge, Mass. technical services firm for an undisclosed sum. Sala is a subsidiary of Boliden AB, Swedish multinational mining firm with 1973 sales of \$350 million.

Arboga Machines of Sweden buys Homestead Machine Tool Corp. of Norwalk, Conn., its US sales outlet for geared-head drilling machines.

Scottish & Newcastle Vintners, Ltd., a unit of an Edinburg, Scotland brewing concern, buys Simi Winery, a privately held Healdsburg, Calif. vintner for an undisclosed, but estimated multi-million-dollar amount.

J. Lyons & Co., London-based food processing, hotel and restaurant firm, converts its corporate bond holding into 47% controlling interest of Chicago's TFI Cos. stock. TFI is a food and beverage processing concern.

A Swiss watch firm, Societe Suisse pour L'industrie Horlogere (SSIH), maker of Omega and Tissot timepieces, increases its minority holdings to 83% ownership of Hamilton Watch Co., Lancaster, Pa., a unit of EMW Industries, a watch and silverware concern of Stamford, Conn. for \$2.4 million.

Contraves AG, Zurich, Switzerland electronic instrument firm, agrees to buy Pittsburgh, Pa.'s Goerz/Inland Systems Div. of Kollmorgen Corp., Hartford, Conn., an electronics manufacturer, pending Federal approval. The new owner will continue the present Goerz business, which is selling Contraves high technology aerospace instruments in the US.

Nestle Alimentana SA of Switzerland, which is increasing its stake in Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago food firm from 56% to 62% will sell off part of LML's frozen food business to two co-packer US firms due to poor profits.

General Anastasio Somoza Debayle, former Nicaraguan President who is rerunning for that office, buys 10% of the Rucker Co., an Oakland, Calif.-based oil-equipment supplier for approximately \$3 million.

BANKING

Fuji Bank Ltd., Tokyo, Japan's third largest, seeks an expanded services office in NY. Also filing there to open a subsidiary branch is the Industrial Bank of Japan Trust Co., that nation's sixth largest. Both banks have NYC agencies which may engage in commercial activities, but cannot accept deposits.

February's Inside USA Report noted unidentified foreign investors as buying the small \$23 million Ahmanson Bank & Trust Co. of Los Angeles, the commercial unit of HF Ahmanson & Co., holder of California's giant Home Savings & Loan Assn., the nation's No. 1 S&L. Now the buyers are revealed as a Taiwanese investor group represented here by former Sen. George Murphy. They will pay \$2 million over book value or \$8 million for AB&T Co.

Federal Reserve proposal to control foreign banks continues to draw fire from international bankers. AF Tuke, head of UK's Barclays Bank, world's fourth largest, says foreigners see Fed plan as discriminatory rather than effort to put overseas banks on an equal footing with domestic banks. He warns Fed's restrictions could boomerang against US banks overseas. JRM VanDen Brink of the Amsterdam-Rotterdam Bank views the proposals as a setback for global banking. NY's giant First National City Bank head, WB Wriston, sees best solution as allowing US banks to branch across state lines, rather than banning multistate foreign banking. He argues nationwide banking already exists through department store chains, credit cards and financial companies. Wriston says the top three retailers have 60% more credit outstanding than the three top banks. Meanwhile, Fed Reserve consults with foreign central bankers on final form of legislation they will seek from Congress, perhaps later this summer.

Meantime, a bill pends in California legislature to permit reciprocal banking with other states. Observers give it little chance this session. Similar NY reciprocal banking bill is snagged in committee. Texas Constitutional change convention vetoes multistate banking proposal before it even gets to voters.

RUMOR DEPARTMENT

Barclays Bank says "no" to rescue takeover of NY's ailing Franklin National Bank, but two other big British banks are also seen as candidates to bail out faltering US bank. National Westminster Bank and Midland Bank, the UK's second and third ranking, could possibly salvage Franklin without creating antitrust problems.

Japanese investment stresses southeastern US projects where an expert Nippon official describes the region as being "cheerfully conservative" and "tremendously enthusiastic" regarding further development. Japan has many investment plans for textile, electronics and other assembly plants for the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi and Florida. The official hints Japan also has a "definite interest" in the possibility of a deep sea oil port off Georgia's coast.

Fuji Spinning Co., NY subsidiary of Tokyo's Fuji Boreki KK, one of Japan's leading textile concerns, seriously studies sites for a new yarn spinning mill in the South. Currently under consideration are several locations in Mississippi and Georgia.

DEATH IN ATLANTA: TRAGEDY, ONCE AGAIN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, it seems that senseless violence strikes at only the

very best among us. Today, we mourn the death of Alberta Williams King, shot and killed Sunday on the pulpit of the Ebenezer Baptist Church in Atlanta.

Mrs. King was a quiet American. She remained aloof from the speechmaking, marching and ultimate national prominence that could have been hers. She sought only to live a good, Christian life and help raise the childrer of her slain son, Martin Luther King, Jr.

On June 30, 1974, she died the American death, by means of insane violence. What can one say?

NATIONAL SOARING WEEK— JULY 1 TO 7

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, today, I join with my colleague, Congressman JAMES HASTINGS, of New York, in introducing a resolution proclaiming the week of July 1 through 7 as National Soaring Week. It is fitting to note that the birthplace of soaring is Elmira, N.Y., which I formerly represented here in Congress and which is now represented by Congressman HASTINGS.

I am including for the information of our fellow Members of the House and the Senate, an article on soaring so that all may have a better understanding of this exciting sport and join with us in commemorating National Soaring Week:

TRY A SOARING ADVENTURE

Nearly 20 years ago my seniority had finally inched upwards to the point where I bid and was awarded one of the much sought after one-day trips, monthly blocks of time. Great balls of fire; what more could you ask for? One day on, two days off, home every night and each workday scheduled for 7:59 flying time.

The one-day trip did have a few modest disadvantages though. First, it was scheduled in DC-3s that were not exactly in new-yacht condition. Secondly, the routing of Washington-Baltimore-Harrisburg-Williamsport - Elmira - Rochester-Buffalo-Erie-Pittsburgh-Washington between 6 a.m. and 5 p.m. gave one an excellent view of the Allegheny mountains, pilots' graveyard-like effect and generally the lousiest weather in the U.S.

In the winter you pumped prop alcohol and froze; and in the summer, you flew either with the side window open or the rain apron over your lap. It was during one of these exciting mail and/or milk runs that the left Wright R-1820 banger gave up the ghost in Elmira, N.Y. There, I was inadvertently introduced to two of America's leading sailplane pioneers and foremost sailplane manufacturers, Ernie and Paul Schweizer, and my soaring-sailplane hobby was launched.

Over the years I met many airline pilot members of the soaring fraternity and learned that the answers to the question "Why do airline pilots take up soaring?" are as numerous and varied as there are airline pilots who fly sailplanes. Some of the most ofheard reasons are:

(1) Psychotherapy! Any airline pilot who spends a considerable amount of his life sitting in the cockpit, number 10 for take-off at La Guardia, JFK, Washington National, O'Hare, etc. breathing the fumes of 30 or

50 JT-9D engines ahead of him deserves a hobby that is somewhat different.

(2) The opportunity to use and increase skills already possessed (a somewhat esoteric reason and one the Internal Revenue Service might disagree with if you try to deduct the modest training expense).

(3) The challenge of beating/understanding "Mother Nature" at her own game through skill and cunning (this is a good reason and most likely one of the leading instigators for so many taking up this sport).

(4) The joy of flying like a bird; no muss, fuss, or nasty engine juices to pollute your auditory or olfactory nerves (this is called the Jonathon Livingstone Seagull Syndrome).

(5) The camaraderie of a first class sailplane-soaring club (there are many of these located throughout the U.S., most logically near major metropolitan areas where you will find many professional people just like yourself who are a real pleasure to know).

(6) The competition involved in a local, regional, or national soaring contest (many of these occur throughout the U.S., which give those competitors who have the urge to win the chance to pit their skills against the best in the U.S., and if good enough, against the best in the world as part of the U.S. team in the World Championships).

(7) Just plain curiosity.

SOARING TIPS

Unless you fly for Bazooka Feeder Airways and are based at Miasma, Ky., the chances are that your pilot base is a major metropolitan city, almost all of which have a soaring center nearby.

The average (which does not exist) airline pilot can easily solo a Schweizer 2-22 or 2-33 sailplane after two or three dual instruction flights depending upon how current you are in truly light aircraft. Though they may be light in your vernacular, Lear Jets, Bonanzas, and Beech Barons do not count.

What really counts is current time in Piper J-3s, PA-12s, Super Cubs and other motorized kites under 900 pounds that have stalling speeds around 35-40 MPH. If you have not flown one of these for a while, go back and recheck out as it will hasten your sailplane solo, make it more fun and probably eliminate any embarrassment on those first few sailplane flights.

The time of year and existing weather are important considerations in deciding when to take the sailplane plunge, even if your only reason for doing so is curiosity. If you pick a cold dark day with no possibility of lift, thermals or otherwise, you are going to be greatly disappointed; and probably, after your first solo, give up the whole thing as a bad trip and waste of time that was as much fun as flying the old blue-and-yellow Link trainer.

Do not be misled by the eager local Glider CFI who wishes to fill that empty seat with you on that dark day as I assure you, you will be disappointed. As a professional airline pilot flying 70-80 hours per month you will not enjoy the thrill of being towed up 3,000 feet only to land 10 or 15 minutes later at the same spot where you started.

Flying a sailplane when there is no lift about is actually much worse than sitting on a sailboat when there is no wind. On the sailboat you can at least play cards. In your sailplane all you do is run up your tow plane bill. I have checked out a few of my airline pilot friends on days like this and to a man, they never came back again.

CHECKOUT FLIGHT

Come with me on a typical airline pilot checkout ride in a Schweizer 2-22 or 2-33 sailplane. It is a comfortable, high-wing, medium-performance trainer that is so stable and forgiving that even 14 year olds (minimum age for gliders) solo it after a few hours dual.

We will assume you have studied FAA regulations on gliders and memorized the

glider patterns and IP (initial point) altitude for the airport we are using. Our calculated adjusted runway length required today is 800 feet. Vr will be 45 MPH and we will be flying high slot formation on a 300-foot tow line behind a Super Cub.

After a two-minute walk-around inspection, we check the wing spar attachment pins for being in and locked. This is necessary as its last landing might have been in some pea patch where the wings were removed and the sailplane trailed home.

Getting in the front cockpit you will be struck by the lack of instrumentation. There will be an airspeed indicator (reading down to 30 MPH), a sensitive Kollsman altimeter, and a rate of climb indicator plus possibly a more-sensitive pneumatic variometer with two tubes; one with a red ball (down) and the other with a green ball (up). That's all.

Our tow plane warms up and taxis about 200 feet in front of us. Seat belts and shoulder straps locked, a helper snaps on the tow line and waits for you to check the release. You pull the release. Yep, it works. He re-fastens and holds the slack line above his head so the tow pilot can see it in his rear view mirror and taxi ahead till taut. Our helper walks over to the wing resting on the ground and lifts it level. The tow pilot waggles his rudder, "Are you ready?" You waggle your rudder and ailerons, "Yes" and off we go in a cloud of grass seed.

The ailerons bite at about 5 MPH so you have no trouble holding your wings level. The tail comes up at about 10-15 MPH by itself allowing the Super Cub tow plane to accelerate speedily to 40 MPH where a gentle back pressure rotates us at about 45 MPH.

We hold 3-5 feet altitude till the Cub is climbing, and then try to fly slot formation with him by setting up a sight line so that the top of his rudder lines up exactly with the center of his overhead window directly behind his top-center windshield.

This being your first sailplane formation flight you sashay up and down, and left and right a bit until you get the feel of this machine, whose heading is totally dependent upon the whims of that Super Cub driver.

Just as soon as you have mastered flying straight ahead, he will start a turn to the left that blows the whole thing. We sashay some more until you find your optimum slot for a climbing turn.

After four to five minutes, to your relief, you reach 3,000 feet and pull the tow release which yields a giant "pop." You bank right in a slight climb to bleed off airspeed to minimum sink speed of about 45 MPH. The first thing you notice is the quietness. You do a couple of left and right stalls, losing as little altitude as possible. If you thought it was quiet when we released from the tow plane, it is like an anechoic chamber during the stalls . . . dead silence. The farmer 2,500 feet below us on his tractor is the one making the noise.

Before we took off we agreed upon a specific IP check point and minimum altitude there for entering the pattern. On this first flight we circle moderately whenever we're in lift, not trying to set any records. Your main job, after minimal airwork to get the feel of the ship, is to get us to the IP.

Today, this is easy as we towed upwind and picked up 5-10 minutes of thermal lift, which is going to give us almost optimum 40-45 minute block-to-block flight. You already know how to fly like an eagle. All you need is a little practice to fly like a seagull.

You reach the IP at 1,200 feet, coast on downwind leg to 1,000 feet, turn base to 800 feet and then straight in on final, holding 60-65 MPH all the way. Depending on the wind down the field, you deploy your spoilers (negative thrust) to put us right on the spot for a perfect landing. Pull the spoiler handle even harder, you actuate the single wheel brake and we stop exactly at the lined white line in the grass where the sailplane launch

began. Hand operated spoilers are what make most sailplane spot landing contests so close. Even the novice can hit a spot within a few feet.

We do the same flight one or two more times, but add a little thermal centering. Where did it go? Which wing rose first? Thermal search pattern. If we were lucky or we chose the right kind of day for your sailplane introduction, we caught at least one real boomer bubble of rising hot air and rode it almost up to cloud base. No fog flying, please. We do not even have an electric turn and bank in this training sailplane. If the thermals have been kind to us, you probably now have at least two hours dual to your credit, can do any maneuver (except snap rolls) that an AT-6 can do, have confidence in your energy management technique (that's what soaring is all about), and are ready to launch into the wild blue by yourself. Good luck, stay upwind of the field and keep your head out of the cockpit.

A few suggestions about purchasing sailplanes:

Rule One: Don't for your first year.

Rule Two: Join a club first. Every major metropolitan area has one or more.

Rule Three: Remember, a sailplane requires a tow plane, a tow plane pilot, a trailer and ground crew for cross country; the smallest consortium that should try to "roll their own" sailplane and tow plane is five. Fewer won't work and more are too many unless they're airline pilots with varied schedules.

Rule Four: When you do decide to buy your own sailplane, do not purchase an exotic foreign-built craft as the certification, spare parts and annual inspections will drive you nuts.

Rule Five: Used sailplanes are like used cars; that is, in most cases, "bad news." Unless it was owned by your mother or brother you will never know how much body putty lies beneath that sparkling paint job or how long it sat in the rain or which tree top or mountain ridge it made an unscheduled landing on. A good competition 1-26, 1-34, or even 1-35 with trailer can be had for between 6 and 11 big bills.

Good luck, and may your soaring days be filled with lots of lift and Zero Sink.

THE ILLUSION OF AN AMERICAN HEALTH CARE CRISIS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, those who seek to impose upon us a system of nationalized medical care repeatedly state that there is a "health care crisis" in the United States.

The fact is that the overwhelming majority of Americans at the present time are protected against major health expenses. As of 1970, 164 million persons under 65—89 percent of the total—had some form of protection against medical costs. About 140 million Americans, it is estimated, have some protection well above the minimum. Those over 65 are covered by medicare, and the indigent are covered by medicaid. Clearly, the "need" for a national health insurance system does not exist.

Beyond this, it is clear that the health of the American people is improving at a dramatic pace. Consider a number of serious diseases and the number of deaths per 100,000 population from these diseases in 1900 and in 1970.

In 1900, the death rate for measles was 13.3, in 1970 it was 0.1. The death rate for diphtheria was 40.3 in 1900 and 0.0 in 1970, for whooping cough the 1900 rate was 12.2, the 1970 rate, 0.0. For dysentery the rate was 12.0 in 1900 and 0.1 in 1970. For tuberculosis 194.4 in 1900 and 2.7 in 1970.

In his important book, "The Case For American Medicine," New York Times correspondent Harry Schwartz states that:

Against this background the question of how one can seriously speak of a health crisis recurs in the early 1970s. Perhaps the kindest answer is to refer to the revolution of rising expectations. A population exposed to incessant publicity . . . about the miracles of modern medicine takes for granted the enormous progress of the past and even of the present and wonders why anyone should be sick, or even why anyone should die.

On May 31, 1974 Marvin Edwards, the distinguished former editor of *Private Practice* magazine and author of the book, "Hazardous To Your Health," concerning the failures of socialized medicine, testified before the House Ways and Means Committee.

In his testimony, Mr. Edwards disputed a number of claims made by the proponents of nationalized medicine. One relates to the alleged "doctor shortage." The conclusion that the United States needed 50,000 additional physicians was, declared Mr. Edwards:

Based on a number of somewhat ridiculous predicates—for example, the belief that it was necessary to produce a surplus of doctors to enable us to loan medical personnel to underdeveloped nations. Today the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare warns that we may instead face a doctor surplus.

We were told, Mr. Edwards points out, that:

There was a maldistribution of doctors, so the Johnson Administration appointed a Presidential Advisory Commission on Health Manpower, and learned that 98 percent of the population lives within 15 or 20 minutes of a major health center.

Mr. Edwards declares:

Today no serious student of health care in the United States believes there is a health crisis.

A problem which does exist, Mr. Edwards notes, is:

The increase in cost . . . a direct result of the inflation caused by excessive federal spending, and in the case of increased hospital costs since 1965, due in part to the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Mr. Edwards' solution: a tax credit for the money individuals spend for health, not socialized medicine.

I wish to share with my colleagues the testimony of Marvin Edwards before the House Ways and Means Committee on May 31, 1974, and insert that testimony into the RECORD at this time.

TESTIMONY OF MARVIN H. MICKEY EDWARDS

My name is Marvin H. Mickey Edwards. For five years I was editor of *Private Practice* magazine, and more recently was employed as a consultant on health care legislation to a number of members of the House of Representatives. I am the author of the book "Hazardous to Your Health," which explores the allegations of a health care crisis in this country and reviews the results of national health care programs in this country and

abroad. I am a director of the American Conservative Union, and to the extent that my views coincide with the published views of that organization, I speak today in its behalf. I am not a physician and to the extent that my testimony reflects a segmented viewpoint, it is the viewpoint of what has come to be known as the medical consumer, although I still think of myself, when I enter my doctor's office, as a patient rather than a buyer—and I hope he thinks of me that way, too.

If I speak for anybody other than myself, it is for my family, my friends, all of the people I love and who will be adversely affected by some of the health care proposals which have been produced by members of Congress. Unlike so-called consumer advocates, who also represent small segments of the population, but pretend to speak for all, I will not let myself have the luxury of making such a claim.

Gentlemen, let me begin by suggesting that in the continuing debate over alternative methods of delivering and financing health care, not all of the available options are being given full and fair consideration.

I have frequently heard discussions of the various health care options, and they usually cover the entire spectrum from A to B. In other words, federal involvement on a major scale or federal involvement on a less major scale. National Health Insurance Plan A, National Health Insurance Plan A revised, or National Health Insurance Plan A minus.

Well I would like to offer a novel idea for your consideration: an option C. That new alternative, seldom considered, is the current health system—a system of free choice, private and personal care, and proven high quality.

The debate over national health insurance is a good example of a proposed solution living on for years, on its own momentum, long after the so-called problem has ceased to exist.

What got all of this started, several years ago, was the insistence by some members of the society that the United States was in the midst of a health care crisis. As is frequently the case, such charges are quickly accepted and become the accepted wisdom of the day. Today the campaign for national health insurance, as an answer to that crisis, lives on past the general recognition that the crisis itself was non-existent.

Obviously in such a short time I cannot provide the documentation necessary for what I am about to say. This committee will be provided with a more extensive written statement and with citations to sources. For now, however, let me only make these observations.

One aspect of the alleged health crisis was the insistence that there existed in the United States a major doctor shortage—a shortage of 50,000 physicians was the figure in vogue, I believe. That conclusion was based on a number of somewhat ridiculous predicates—for example, the belief that it was necessary to produce a surplus of doctors to enable us to loan medical personnel to underdeveloped nations overseas. Today the Department of Health, Education and Welfare warns that we may instead face a doctor surplus. Who can know if that is true, either?

But it is clear at least that there is no major shortage of doctors in this country, and in fact the number of physicians in the United States has been increasing three times as fast as the population and the United States has more doctors per capita than any of the major European nations to which we are so frequently compared.

We were told there was a serious maldistribution of doctors, so the Johnson administration appointed a Presidential Advisory Commission on Health Manpower, and learned that 98 percent of the population lives within 15 or 20 minutes of a major health center. And a study by Hillsdale College in Michigan revealed that most of the

counties without private physicians have extremely small resident populations. For example, there is one county in California without a private doctor, and that county has fewer residents than were in my high school graduating class.

We were told there was a serious infant mortality problem, and then learned that the sourcebook for the allegation plainly stated that the infant mortality statistics listed for this and other countries were not comparable due to variables in the reporting systems.

Today no serious student of health care in the United States believes there is a health crisis—but the campaign goes on.

I would submit that if there is any problem it exists not in care or its availability, but in its cost—and the increase in its cost is a direct result of the inflation caused by excessive federal spending, and in the case of increased hospital costs since 1965, due in part to the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Nearly 90 percent of the American population has private health insurance, and although most of the policies they hold do not cover catastrophic expenses, the incidence of catastrophic loss is quite small—less than one percent—and private major medical insurance is available at low cost.

I acknowledge that today's insurance policies do not cover the entire cost of many illnesses—but that was not always the case. It is not that the policies are deliberately or inherently inadequate, but that there is no way insurance or anything else can keep up with the unbelievable rate of inflation which will persist until Congress stops debating whether it favors a \$40 billion program or a \$70 billion one, and instead holds down its own spending and allows inflation to subside.

There are great dangers in the course of seeping political solutions to politically-caused problems. No health expert today will deny that the Medicare program has been an expensive failure. No person familiar with local and state financing will deny that the Medicaid program has driven state after state to serious financial problems. No student of the involvement of government into health care can avoid the fact that under the British system, which some of our politicians want to emulate, there were no new hospitals built for 14 years after the National Health Service was inaugurated. They cannot escape the fact that British doctors left practice by the thousands. They cannot explain away the fact that there were soon long waiting periods—sometimes more than a year—for non-emergency hospitalizations, and more than 100,000 people on hospital waiting lists.

Compare that record with the United States where most patients can get into a hospital within a couple of weeks at the most, and often in a single day. Compare the waiting lists in Britain with the fact that in the United States there are usually hundreds of thousands of hospital beds available on any given day. Abundance is our strength; scarcity is the inevitable result of government medicine.

And consider the fact that when a third party pays for health care, instead of the patient, doctors soon become flooded with people who don't really need their care, and have little time for patients who are truly sick, as evidenced by the experiences of the Kaiser-Permanente system.

In conclusion, let me make this suggestion to you. If you are truly interested in seeing to it that Americans can more easily afford the cost of health care, there are two things you can do.

First, of course, you can stop spending so much of our money. For every dollar you spend, we must pay something either in higher taxes or increased inflation. That leaves us less money to pay for our health care, and makes that care more expensive.

Second, you can consider a different kind of legislation. Every American taxpayer would have more money available to meet even inflationary costs if so much wasn't

taken away from him by the tax collector to pay for your spending. So I propose that if you really want to help him, you can require a change in the tax laws to permit tax credits for money spent on health care, i.e., after a taxpayer computes his income tax, without deductions for health care or insurance, he simply subtracts from the bottom line whatever he spent during the year for health care, health insurance premiums, catastrophic or major medical premiums, preventive checkups, etc. This, of course, also encourages the taxpayer to take the preventive measures so many members of Congress have been concerned about.

If the taxpayer owed, after all other computations, a tax of \$2,000, and he had spent \$700 on health care and insurance, his tax bill would be reduced by \$700 and he would owe \$1,300 instead.

I realize that proposal lacks the complexity which so endears legislation to the bureaucracy, and because the money will never come to Washington in the first place, it will eliminate the need for a number of bureaus, agencies and expensive middlemen. Nonetheless, I believe it has merit.

Gentlemen, ask not what the taxpayer and patient can do for political theory, ask instead what his country can do to take the tax burden from him. Thank you.

LEVEL OF MEAT IMPORTS DOWN— NO REASON TO IMPOSE QUOTAS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, the Department of Agriculture released its third quarterly estimate of the level of meat imports covered by the Meat Import Quota Act of 1964. These latest statistics show a dramatic decline in the level of imports—and disprove the claims by American cattlemen that a reimposition of the quota is needed. As Acting Secretary J. Phil Campbell noted:

The current situation in the U.S. livestock industry is not the result of an increase in imports of meats subject to the law.

Following is a table, prepared by the Department which shows the level of imports during the past 3½ years. As the figures clearly show, the level of imports is expected to decline dramatically this year.

LEVEL OF MEAT IMPORTS

[In millions of pounds]

Month	1971	1972	1973	1974
January	83.4	86.9	106.2	118.0
February	65.1	80.8	98.4	82.3
March	88.4	75.4	88.3	104.9
April	86.2	105.4	97.0	91.4
May	76.8	107.9	113.0	80.6
June	101.0	106.4	91.5
July	94.4	106.8	106.0
August	104.9	164.6	153.7
September	158.6	163.8	110.3
October	80.4	145.2	150.0
November	63.2	119.0	130.0
December	130.3	93.4	109.1
Total	1,132.6	1,355.5	1,354.4	1,210

¹ Rejections which occur after entry is made are included in the published census figures and amounted to 21,000,000 lb for 1971, 17,800,000 lb for 1972, and 18,400,000 lb for 1973.

² Estimated.

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

The problems facing American cattlemen are caused by domestic prices which are too high. Their problems are not due to imports. Imports constitute only 8.5 percent of total American beef consumption. Yet imported meats are generally lower grade cuts—the type of meat used in processed foods, hamburger, and sausage. To further restrict the level of foreign meat imports would be to eliminate low-cost meats from the American dinner table. It would be a restriction that would be felt by the low income, the elderly, and those with large families. To further restrict the level of meat imports would be one of the most anticonsumer actions which this Congress, or any Congress, could take.

I urge the Secretary of Agriculture to continue the suspension of the meat import quota law so that the maximum amount of low-cost meat may be available to the American consumer.

THE EADS BRIDGE AND THE INCOMPARABLE MR. EADS

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that July 4, 1974 not only marks the anniversary of our independence, but is also the centennial of one of America's foremost engineering and construction achievements—the Eads Bridge over the Mississippi River at St. Louis.

The St. Louis community and its congressional delegation have been cooperating in an effort to encourage the U.S. Postal Service to issue a stamp commemorating the Eads Bridge and the remarkable man who built it, Capt. James Buchanan Eads. I would like to share with my colleagues at this time an article "The Eads Bridge and the Incomparable Mr. Eads" written by Mr. Joseph E. Vollmar, Jr. Mr. Vollmar is a constituent of mine and president of the Engineers' Club of St. Louis, which was founded over a hundred years ago by engineers working on the Eads Bridge.

The article follows:

THE EADS BRIDGE AND THE INCOMPARABLE MR. EADS

(By Joseph E. Vollmar, Jr.)

It would take a spectacular show to beat fireworks down on the levee on the second of July, but James Buchanan Eads was just the man to present it.

His great bridge spanning the Mississippi was finished at last, and he wanted to prove it wouldn't fall down. He had invited everybody in St. Louis to the show.

But by the 1870's one of every four bridges was falling; and before the decade was over, more than forty a year would collapse. Would his bridge fall this day?

Many sensible people thought so. It was almost eerie the troubles the self-proclaimed engineer had had in the seven years it had taken to build the bridge: unbelievable political and financial wrangles, shipwrecks, ice storms, tornadoes and fourteen men strangely dead from "caisson disease". Was Eads' fantasy heroic or a monumental folly?

If foolish, it was going to be catastrophic this day—July 2, 1874. Captain Eads had arranged the spectacle himself. Fourteen fifty-ton locomotives, their tenders filled with coal, water and daredevil passengers, were lined up to cross to the Illinois side. First seven were to go in a sort of warm up, then fourteen with seven on each track and finally the whole lot in one mighty, chugging pull.

Thousands stood on the banks and upper roadway of the bridge and on the waterfront. They gaped as the engineers started up, their engines noisy and eager. Suddenly, one engineer reversed his engine, and the wheels of his locomotive spun in reverse. The onlookers gasped as the balky locomotive was literally dragged across the bridge by the momentum of the other locomotives.

The bridge did not fall.

It was a miracle to the spectators. But to Eads, it was only a flourishing finish to the job he had set out to do. "Must we admit that because a thing never has been done, it never can be?" Eads had asked a convention of twenty-seven engineers on August 20, 1867.

Now, "seven years and seven million dollars later", as tongues wagged, the St. Louis Bridge was the world's first alloy steel bridge and, in fact, the first important construction of any sort in steel. It was also the biggest bridge of any type ever built up to that time. It was the first to use tubular chord members and the first to depend, in the building of the superstructure, entirely upon the use of cantilever, with no false works employed. It was the first, important use, and the deepest, of compressed air in America. And the caisson that Eads sank for his East Abutment foundations remains nearly one hundred years later the deepest at which compressed air workers ever have worked.

In his remarks before President Ulysses S. Grant on the official day of dedication two days later, Captain Eads spoke of his own claim and certainty that the bridge would endure. He said that people had commented that he must be relieved to discover his bridge was sound. "But I felt no relief," he said, "because I felt no anxiety." As much as any man who ever lived, he was the right man for the right job at the right time.

Slight but muscular "Captain" James Buchanan Eads, whose cousin would become President, had earned his title in a lifetime of hard, onerous work on and in the river. As a thirteen-year-old, he had arrived with his parents from Indiana via Louisville, the steamboat having literally burned beneath them on the day of their arrival in 1833. While his genial but destitute father moved on to the new town of Parkhurst, Iowa, young James sold apples on the riverfront, then went to work for a drygoods merchant to help his mother out. It was the merchant, Barrett Williams, who provided books, particularly textbooks on mechanical engineering and the design of boats, that Eads studied.

At nineteen, James signed on with the "Knickerbocker", a steamboat in the Northern lead trade, as the second clerk. This boat, too, sank upon being ripped open by a snag in the river; and the young man decided that the Mississippi River bottom was a storehouse of treasures simply waiting to be salvaged. He designed a boat with twin hulls, derricks and pumps and offered a part of a business in salvaging to two young shipbuilders who would make it for him, St. Louisans Calvin Case and William Nelson. Though the boat was certainly different than other river craft, James Buchanan Eads was, nevertheless, its "captain".

The river beds were every bit as fascinating as the riverfronts and Eads, in what he called his "submarine," found sunken boats in the Cumberland, the Tennessee, the Ohio and Missouri, as well as his native Mississippi. All of this cargo he disposed of for profit and his prospects seemed good.

But neither he nor his prospects looked very promising to arrogant Colonel Dillon, whose daughter, Martha, James wanted to marry. The young suitor sold his business to venture into glassmaking but was beset with petty crises. Pots broke, whole batches of glass were ruined, his men quit, and his glassware, considered a luxury, didn't sell during the recession. In 1848, he borrowed fifteen hundred dollars, bought back his share in the "submarine" and returned to the river to dive for shipwrecked cargo.

Years later, after Martha had died of cholera, and he had remarried the widow of a cousin, Eunice Hagerman Eads, he grew prosperous as the captain of seven submarines. He retired to Compton Hill and a palatial house he built. During the Civil War, he used his knowledge of the Mississippi and his experience at boat design to engineer the first ironclad gunboats. Though others had also designed ironclads, it was Eads' monitors that were the best of them, opening up the Confederate-held lower Mississippi to commerce again.

A small bridge company was organized in 1866 and James Eads was chosen Chief Engineer because of his intimate understanding of the Mississippi, and particularly the river bed. Other pilots could read the surface skillfully for menacing, hidden snags and bars but only Eads knew the fluid, shifting, treacherous bed. He had seen the depth change from 20 to 100 feet at obstacles in the bottom as the result of the scouring action of currents. For more than thirty years, he had watched the river rise and recede as much as 41 feet, ice floes pile up to a depth of 20 feet and tornadoes strike like giant fists.

The controversial blueprint was of a bridge with three spans supported by four piers. Three of these piers would rest on bedrock and the fourth on metal spikes driven into the rock. Two of the spans were to be 502 feet with the one in the center, 520 feet. Three arches of steel between the piers would be erected by cantilevering. No other falsework would be used, and therefore river traffic could move freely during the building.

The Chief Engineer and his assistants, Colonel Henry Flad and Charles Pfeiffer, sank a cofferdam on the site for the West Abutment. Of two courses of sheet piling, it was a box-like structure driven down through the sand bed of the stream to bedrock, a depth of 47 feet below "high water", the height of a memorable flood of 1828. One course of the sheet piling was inside of the other with a six-foot margin between, a box within a box, and the margin filled with clay. Men pumped out the enclosure, removed debris and excavated the sand.

But the laborers struck the grave of 29 steamers which had burned and sunk in the great fire of 1849 and the cofferdam came to rest on a part of these wrecks. Chains, old engines and the remains of aged barges were also buried there and had to be removed. Excavation was agonizingly slow and construction lagged during the winters of 1868 and 1869.

Though Congress approved his report on the bridge and Boomer was appeased, Captain Eads had to quit the work. He had contracted severe bronchitis in 1868 and decided to go abroad to convalesce, a prescription at the time for those who could afford it. What the engineer saw in Europe greatly altered his plans for the West and East Piers and the East Abutment.

Eads returned to St. Louis and his previous "headaches." At home, he reasoned that he needed experience before sinking a caisson to the great depth of the East Abutment site. He decided to construct the East Pier, where bedrock would be next deepest.

The pneumatic caissons which were built by Eads' former partner in his submarine business, William Nelson, were described by Eads as "enormous elliptical bells, 82 feet

long, open at the bottom," made of wood and sheathed with iron for a cutting edge. The one for the East Pier was 60 feet wide, that for the West Pier 48 feet wide. As the workmen kept digging, the cutting edge settled further into the river bed toward rock. Steadily, they removed the stones, debris and other impediments by means of the sand pump and other workmen disposed of these away from the site of the abutment.

As the excavators, who would be called "sandhogs" in a later day, burrowed deeper, a few had stomach pains or fleeting paralysis.

Dr. A. Jaminet, called in by Eads to help the ailing men, wrote later, "A workman walking about with difficult step and a slight stoop was at first regarded as a fit object for jokes, and cases of paralysis soon became popularly known by the name of 'Grecian Bend'." It was, of course, what is now called the "bends", and, though unknown to Eads or Jaminet at the time, referred to in Europe as "caisson disease".

When the chamber was 76 feet underwater a workman suffered such severe abdominal pains he had to be taken to a hospital. Noting that many who suffered were alcoholic and undernourished, the Chief Engineer shortened the work periods, instituted rests, served beef tea; but the men, bored, spent free time in the nearest waterfront saloons.

The East Pier caisson reached bedrock after four months at 93½ feet underwater, although high water depth would be 26 feet greater. During the course of filling the air chamber with masonry, a freshet caused the river to rise alarmingly. Ten days later, James Reilly came to the surface, said he felt fine, toppled over and died. He was the first casualty of "caisson disease" in America. Thirteen other sand excavators died during the building of the bridge, all but one on the East and West Piers. Casualties were kept at a minimum on the East Abutment because of the even more rigorous discipline Dr. Jaminet insisted upon, perhaps.

Three of the four great supports were at bedrock, and the caisson for the East Abutment was towed into place on November 3, 1870. It was an enormous, iron-sheathed monster, requiring a boat-mounting with a ten foot draft. Three steamboats towed it across the river to the Illinois shore.

The foundation for the East Abutment progressed in fits and starts. During the winter, a huge ice gorge was deflected by a breakwater from breaking up the caisson. Spring floods threatened the abutment masonry. But the greatest peril was a raging tornado that crumpled the superstructure in minutes. The damage was repaired and the work resumed, and the East Abutment at last stood on bedrock 127½ feet below the directrix or 110 feet when the water level was "normal".

After three and a half years, the foundations stood, unshakable, in the river bed awaiting the steel arches.

The outstanding steel company of the day, Keystone Bridge Company of Pittsburgh, was headed by J. H. Linville, who had so rudely criticized Eads' bridge as "unsafe and impracticable" in the blueprint stage. He still wanted nothing to do with the Bridge in 1870, but his brash vice-president, Andrew Carnegie, could sniff money. Keystone became the major subcontractor through Linville and Carnegie thought Eads' demands for quality were outrageous.

The financial wizard grumbled, "Nothing that would and does please engineers is good enough for this work."

Keystone subcontracted the work to Butcher Steel Company of Philadelphia, and Carnegie kept the wrought iron order for his own firm, Carnegie and Kloman. But, even so, wrought-iron skewbacks, enormous plates and sockets weighing three and a half tons each, which, bolted to the arch ends, were to be formed solid and the holes drilled—unheard of.

The assistant engineers, Flad and Pfeiffer,

had devised a machine for testing strength and Eads had this installed in the Butcher plant. But after six months and 6,000 steel staves, none could be used. Two more steel firms were called in until one could make the proper alloy, and then not every stave could meet the test.

The cost of the bridge to March 1, 1872 was over \$4,000,000 with another nearly three million needed for completion. A story of two men crossing on the good, old reliable ferry, one a St. Louisan and the other a stranger, had survived. The stranger had asked his acquaintance, "How much will it cost to build the bridge?"

"Seven million dollars," the acquaintance had exaggerated.

"And how long will it take to build it?"

"Seven million years."

Already five years of the seven million had gone by, and there had been the wreckage under the West Abutment, the extra costs of sinking the caisson to bedrock at the East Abutment, caisson disease, the tornado and now wrangles over the steel and wrought iron parts. Eads went to the factories to oversee the making of these parts himself.

The building of the arches was, itself, a great engineering feat. To that time, arch bridges had been supported by centering—timber falsework—in the river during raising. Eads could not obstruct the Mississippi so he projected the arches beyond the piers by cantilevering—falsework above the abutment or pier to balance the thrust of the arches.

Both Eads and Flad had solutions for closing. Eads' way was to lop off the final two steel tubes five inches and cut screw threads inside the ends of the tubes. A short wrought-iron plug fitted with two sets of threads could be screwed in, and, at the arch closing, drawn out to fit across, holding the two together. A steel band would give the joint greater strength.

Assistant Engineer Flad would, instead, hump the arch slightly to bring the joining ribs together, and the arch would assume its proper form when the cables were removed. Flad decided to close by his method.

On September 14, 1873, Captain Eads was in London negotiating a new loan which was contingent upon a deadline five days later for the closing of the arches. Hot weather hit, and the ribs expanded instead of contracting. Flad built long troughs under the ribs to hold, first, thirty thousand pounds of ice, then sixty. The workmen wrapped the ribs in gunny cloth which soaked up the ice water, but the temperature wouldn't quit; it rose steadily to 98 degrees by five o'clock in the afternoon on the 16th of September, and the tubes, once only a mere five-eighths of an inch too long, grew. After fifty hours on the job, the men used Eads' extensible links instead.

No sooner were the arches closed than a new political hassle loomed. Steamboaters objected to the height of the arches, only a 55-foot clearance for their smokestacks, which, in some cases, were 100 feet above the water. Unbelievably, the Secretary of War backed the steamboat demand to rid the river of this obstruction, which could mean tearing the bridge down!

Flabbergasted, Eads and Dr. William Tausig, a vice-president and general manager of the bridge company, went to see President Grant. Dr. Tausig wrote of the meeting that an angry President upbraided the Secretary: "You cannot remove this structure on your own judgment . . . I think, General, you had better drop the case."

In early 1874, Eads made yet one more trip East to reassure bondholders and bankers that the job was nearly done. While in New York, he got a telegram with truly stunning news: two tubes in the first span had ruptured.

Unless the builder could discover the cause, this would mean that the bridge, as conceived, was basically unsound. But the engi-

neer knew his great work well, even at a distance; he reasoned that the steel cantilever cables were probably still attached to the arches and should come down. Probably the cold had contracted the cables causing the ribs to be pulled in the wrong direction. That was why the ribs broke. He wired his superintendent to loosen the cables.

When late spring came, Eads' bridge was under siege. Keystone was to supply workers as well as steel and iron parts, but Carnegie had held out for more bonuses. In February, St. Louis Bridge Company had agreed to pay Keystone officials a thousand dollars for each day before June 1st that railroads and vehicles could use the bridge.

And Keystone was to pay a penalty of five hundred dollars for each day after June 1st required to complete their contract. At once, the arch had swarmed with workers. The upper road of the bridge—for railroads—was finished April 15th.

Carnegie, with his attorney and the manager of Keystone, rushed to St. Louis in Eads' absence to collect their bonus—in advance. Carnegie's last tantrum was to withdraw a part of the agreement to open the upper roadway for railroad traffic and hold the bridge as security. His own workmen constituted the army. "We held the bridge," Carnegie boasted years later. He came out well on the compromise that ensued.

On Sunday, May 24, the sidewalks were opened to pedestrians. The following third of June, Joseph Gartside drove four "spanking" bays hitched to the heaviest of the coal wagons to the other side.

Then it remained only to test the bridge for its primary purpose—providing a railroad link from West to East.

But one fearful, balky railroad engineer apparently felt too much muddy Mississippi had already gone under Eads Bridge. He reversed the wheels of his locomotive in one last, futile effort to stop the great engineer's magnificent show.

The bridge stood.

GILMAN SEEKS RESTORATION OF INDIAN LANDS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Grand Canyon National Park Enlargement Act (S. 1296) is currently awaiting action by the full House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The seemingly good intent of this legislation, providing for enlarging one of our most majestic park areas, is smudged, however, by the threatened obliteration of one of the area's original occupants, the Havasupai Indian tribe.

The Havasupais, numbering only 435, have been settled in the Grand Canyon region since 700 A.D. Because of prior Park Service acquisition, the Havasupai are now confined to a 518-acre reservation at the bottom of the canyon where during the summer months they eke out a meager existence by farming fruits and vegetables. With an average annual income of \$700 and a life expectancy of 44 years, the future of the Havasupai Tribe is not only far from promising, but is critically doubtful without the restoration of additional land.

During consideration of S. 1296, the Senate deleted provisions which would have granted the Havasupais trust title

to a substantial portion of their land. This bill now awaits final action by the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee where attempts will be made to include a trust title for the Havasupais' exclusive use and occupancy rights to 251,000 acres of land.

It is vitally important to the future of the Havasupais and to our own sense of justice that these lands be restored so that the Havasupais will be adequately provided for.

Accordingly I urge my colleagues to familiarize themselves with the plight of the Havasupai tribesmen so that you may vote your conscience when this bill comes before the full House for consideration.

ZUMWALT LEAVING HIS CHANGED NAVY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt last week stepped aside after 4 years as Chief of Naval Operations.

Bud Zumwalt in those 4 years probably brought about more changes for good in the Navy than had been accomplished in any previous 4-year period. As a direct result of his efforts, thousands of sailors have found their lot improved. His concern for the individual sailor and his family was reflected in all his personnel initiatives. As a result, approximately 27 percent of first-termers now are reenlisting, compared to only 10 percent when he took command.

This interest in the welfare of his men, as well as in maintaining a strong defense posture, has made Bud Zumwalt's record one of distinctive achievement. The Navy will miss him at the helm, but it will be better for the changes he implemented as Chief of Operations.

I commend to your attention an article by Bill Anderson in the June 28 Chicago Tribune on Admiral Zumwalt as he stepped aside from his command:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 28, 1974]

ZUMWALT LEAVING HIS CHANGED NAVY (By Bill Anderson)

ANNAPOLIS, Md.—Adm. Elmo R. [Bud] Zumwalt steps aside here tomorrow as chief of naval operations with honors at the academy where he began as a young sailor 32 years ago.

Zumwalt's physical appearance casts him as an admiral. He is a big man, tall and rather stern-looking with bushy eyebrows. My guess is that he would have been a gentleman and a top professional without holding the rank of an officer. This is a view shared by many members of Congress and a very high percentage of the young people serving in the Navy.

But some of the older brass, many of them retired—and determined to preserve, in today's nuclear Navy, traditions that were born in the days of sailing ships—hold opinions that don't rank Zumwalt that high professionally. The views of these would-be helmsmen developed largely because Zumwalt has shaken the personnel policies of the Navy right down to its bell-bottomed trousers.

In four years as the chief, Zumwalt has made life a great deal better for the enlisted personnel and opened doors of opportunity for junior officers as well—literally thousands of sailors who were calling it quits in the old Navy.

The admiral has led a special drive to give an equal break to the once-limited minorities—people like blacks and women. Family life is better in the Navy today because a huge effort has been made to reduce long, solitary tours at sea.

Yet, not even Zumwalt thinks the Navy is in as good condition as it should be. For example, we aren't replacing airplanes as fast they wear out; we have given up 47 per cent of our surface ships in the last five years. A lot of our remaining ships are too old and in poor repair. On a real basis, the Russians continue to build while the United States slides.

At this moment it appears that the United States has given up its capability to control the seas; the possibility of success in the event of a confrontation with the Soviets declines each year. In a way, Zumwalt has been America's Winston Churchill because he has warned both Congress and the public of this erosion.

Yet the factors that have caused a general American military decline—political and social unrest in the aftermath of the Viet Nam War—have in some ways displayed the very real strength of Zumwalt to meet and match change.

From the very beginning, Zumwalt's career has been a series of firsts—and therefore tradition-breaking. He was a very junior naval officer at the end of World War II when his destroyer was the first American ship to reach Shanghai. There he met and married the beautiful Mouza Coutelais-du-Rocher. Tradition had it in those days that a future chief of naval operations would likely be wed immediately upon graduation from Annapolis.

Many years later, in the War College, Zumwalt wrote a military posture statement so brilliant that it found its way to the desk of Paul H. Nitze, then the director of the International Security Affairs office of the Pentagon. When Nitze became Navy secretary, he took Zumwalt along as an aide. It was in this position that Capt. Zumwalt began to reshape once rejected budgets to enable the Navy to maintain a better posture than previously.

Zumwalt went off to Viet Nam (as the Navy's youngest admiral) to work on the line with the generations that fought the losing war. When he became the chief (also the youngest), Zumwalt wasn't very far removed from either the reality of officers' wardrooms, the cloakrooms of Congress, or the often restless and sometimes ugly mood of the fleet sailors.

A staggering 90 per cent of the enlisted ranks were getting out at the first opportunity when he took command. Maintenance suffered as men with critical specialties found a better life among civilians. Enlistments were also off, and education levels were far too low for operation of a computer-electronic fleet.

Against great opposition, Zumwalt initiated the personnel changes. He also found a lot of support. Today approximately 27 per cent of the first-termers are staying in—and therefore saving the taxpayers millions of dollars that would otherwise go for the cost of new training. The highly personal effort of Zumwalt (and others) in Congress to gain approval for the new Trident submarine gives promise of maintaining one element of this nation's strategic force.

We know from interviews that many sailors here—and around the world—will salute Zumwalt tomorrow with more than usual respect because he has fought for their dignity. In doing so, the 53-year-old admiral picked up a great deal more himself.

FOOD SUPPLEMENT ACT

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in response to the growing concern of the American consumer over the Food and Drug Administration's proposed regulation of the sale of vitamins and minerals, I am joining in introducing a bill placing limits upon the power of the FDA.

Such legislation has already been introduced in the House by Mr. HOSMER (H.R. 643), prohibiting the FDA from attempting to ban "truthfully labeled vitamin and mineral food supplements" for reasons other than safety and fraud. This bill, the Food Supplement Act of 1973, prevents the Food and Drug Administration from carrying out its determination to classify safe vitamins and mineral supplements as dangerous drugs and requires the FDA to regulate vitamins and minerals as foods or food supplements, not as drugs.

The FDA regulation states that any dosage of vitamins or minerals exceeding 150 percent of an individual's recommended daily allowance would require a doctor's prescription for purchase. Such a regulation by the FDA interferes with an individual's choice and reflects a usurpation of personal freedom. Accordingly, I urge the passage of legislation curbing the FDA's power to decide, for the public, what are the acceptable dosages of safe vitamin and mineral supplements.

This bill does not weaken the provisions of the Food and Drug Act which protects consumer against false and misleading labeling of foods. Nor does it amend the act's provisions prohibiting the sale of products which are unsafe at recommended dosages. It merely requires the FDA to define the term "food supplement," distinguishing food supplements from drugs—any substance intended to affect the structure or any function of the body. Also, it provides that the Secretary of the FDA "shall not require a warning label on any food supplement unless it is intrinsically injurious to health in the recommended dosage." The FDA regulation seeks to designate a standard percentage of daily allowance—150 percent—as the distinguishing point between drug and nondrug, ignoring varying individual requirements and the psychological benefits that result from the independent taking of such food supplements.

Part 8:8 of the FDA regulation states that—

Lay persons are incapable of determining, by themselves, whether they have, or are likely to develop vitamin or mineral deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, what is suitable for one individual is not necessarily satisfactory for another. Accordingly allowing the FDA to decide for us the levels of deficiencies and excesses is highly improper.

Dr. Linus Pauling, the Nobel Prize winning chemist, has pointed out several shortcomings in the logic of such an FDA proposal, stating that "the FDA is wrong

in forbidding the sale of tablets, or it is remiss in not forbidding the sale of a portion of certain foods," for as he points out, lamb liver, beef liver, and sweet potatoes contain more than the required daily amounts of vitamins, yet are not banned by the FDA.

Because of such inconsistencies, but more importantly because the FDA is denying the American consumer his freedom of choice in regards to the products which are nutritionally sound and important to him, I am supporting this proposal in order to protect the public against an improper imposition of FDA power.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of this measure in this portion of the RECORD:

H.R. 15771

A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Food Supplement Amendment of 1973".

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph (f) of section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(f)) is amended by (1) redesignating clauses (1) and (2) as clauses "(A)" and "(B)", respectively, (2) inserting "(1)" immediately after "(f)", and (3) adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) The term 'food supplement' means food for special dietary uses.

"(3) The term 'special dietary uses', as applied to food for man, means particular (as distinguished from general) uses of food, as follows:

"(A) Uses of supplying particular dietary needs which exist by reason of a physical, physiological, pathological, or other condition, including but not limited to the conditions of diseases, convalescence, pregnancy, lactation, allergic hypersensitivity to food, underweight, and overweight;

"(B) Uses for supplying particular dietary needs which exist by reason of age, including but not limited to the ages of infancy and childhood;

"(C) Uses for supplementing or fortifying the ordinary or usual diet with any vitamin, mineral, or other dietary property.

Any such particular use of food is a special dietary use, regardless of whether such food also purports to be or is represented for general use."

(b) Paragraph (g)(3) of such section 201 is amended by striking out "(other than food)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(other than food or food supplements)".

SEC. 3. Title VII of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 371-377) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY

"Sec. 708. Administering this Act the Secretary—

"(1) shall not limit the potency, number, combination, amount, or variety of any synthetic or natural vitamin, mineral, substance, or ingredient of any food supplement unless such article is intrinsically injurious to health in the recommended dosage, and

"(2) shall not require a warning label on any food supplement unless such article is intrinsically injurious to health in the recommended dosage."

CHARLES E. IVES

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, Charles Edward Ives is today recognized as one of the foremost American composers in contemporary music. He was born in Danbury, Conn., October 20, 1874, son of Mary Parmelee Ives and one of Danbury's leading musical citizens, George Edward Ives, who organized the 1st Connecticut Heavy Artillery Brigade Band at the age of 17, during the Civil War. Ives was educated in Danbury schools and graduated from Yale, Class of '98. His father was responsible for his musical education, encouraging him to learn to play a variety of musical instruments. At the age of 13, his piece "A Holiday Quickstep" was performed by the town band. The Danbury News prophetically proclaimed his "genius" at that time.

To understand what Danbury meant to Ives, one must imagine how that town appeared in the eighties and nineties, with bands marching up and down where his house stood on Main Street. Then imagine how it must have sounded when, in his father's famous experiment, two bands playing different tunes approached each other from opposite directions and collided.

As he said to an interviewer in 1949: Danbury, that's where I was born and grew up and learned a little about music. Pa taught me what I know.

By 1891 Ives had already begun experiments in polytonality, his bold experiments in atonality, polyrhythms, dissonance and antiphones placing him far ahead of every composer of his time.

Upon graduating from college, Ives went into business, establishing his own insurance agency in 1906. He married Harmony Twichell in 1908 and formed the insurance partnership of Ives and Myrick in 1909, continuing in business until 1930 when he retired to west Redding because of ill health.

During his business career, especially during 1900-20, Ives produced an imposing list of musical works, few of which were performed. He received little recognition at first, then hostile criticism.

It was not until John Kirkpatrick gave Ives' Second Piano Sonata its first performance in Town Hall in New York in the year 1939 that a warm appreciation for Ives works began to grow. A devoted friend of Ives, Henry Cowell observed:

Ives took apparently slight elements of American folk-music and by diligence and sympathetic cultivation, found new musical beauty. The style of his finest music is a style of richness and outpouring of warmth and largess. It is humanitarianism applied to sound.

Olin Downes said Ives work contained "gumption." He said:

There is something in this music: real vitality, real naivete and a superb self-respect.

Ives said his Second Symphony "ex-

pressed the musical feelings of the Connecticut county around Redding and Danbury in the 1890's."

Ives won the Pulitzer Prize in 1947 for his Third Symphony which he had composed some 40 years earlier. It was then that his music began to win widespread, respectful attention and, after his death on May 9, 1954, resulted in worldwide recognition of his musical stature.

A man both musically and philosophically far ahead of his time, Ives' open-mindedness in music, and life as well, were most innovative. Ives felt "The time is coming, but not in our lifetime, when music will develop possibilities inconceivable now—a language so transcendent, that its heights and depths will be common to all mankind."

In private life a kind and generous man, Ives was always an "independent Yankee" individual, with a great love for his home State—Connecticut.

In anticipation of the 100th anniversary of his birth, several dedicated Danbury citizens began making plans many months ago for an appropriate observance. They formed a nonprofit group called the Charles Ives Centennial, Inc., of which Connecticut's Governor, Thomas J. Meskill, is honorary chairman, and long-time Danbury resident Marian Anderson is honorary vice chairman.

Dozens of volunteers are devoting their efforts to an event which will take place on July 4, 1974, at the Danbury State Fairgrounds. The Charles Ives Centennial Concert will feature Leonard Bernstein and Michael Tilson Thomas conducting the American Symphony Orchestra in an all-Ives program. McHenry Boatwright will be vocal soloist. More than 200 voices from the Western Connecticut State College Chorus and the Greenwich Choral Society will also sing.

Understandably, this musical tribute to a native son has attracted wide attention. On Sunday, June 23, 1974, the New York Times wrote of this unique Fourth of July celebration: "promises to be a star-spangled event." The results of the Danbury community effort will be restoration of the Ives Homestead, now in a local park. All Americans can be proud of their New England spirit.

This Independence Day, I will be attending this concert in tribute to Charles Ives. Charles Ives grew up in the district which I represent, and I will share with others who attend this event, the pleasure of honoring a great American who has given so much to the world of music.

MRS. KING'S TRAGIC DEATH

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Mrs. Martin Luther King, Sr., a woman who sought and prayed for peace and human kindness, has caused all Americans to unite.

I want to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the sense of shock

and remorse that I feel because of the tragic death of Mrs. Martin Luther King, Sr. Mrs. King, was a woman of kindness and humility whose family has contributed much to the long battle for equality for all Americans.

To see her son, and now Mrs. King, struck down in the pursuit of civil rights for mankind is a heartbreaking experience for all thoughtful Americans.

It is my hope that out of this senseless act will come a renewed determination among people of all races to join together in the pursuit of those goals which the King family held so dear.

THE ROLE OF U.S. COMMERCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest concerns of the new African nations in their relations with the United States is their desire for increased American assistance in meeting the challenge of development. Not only is the United States the richest nation in the world, but it is also a source of aid which does not renew old colonial ties in a new form of economic dependence.

In view of the continent's staggering needs and the presently limited resources that can be mobilized to meet them, it is obvious that foreign aid must play a large role in African modernization. In the past, the United States has generally contributed a little over 25 percent of the outside economic assistance received by Africa. However, the recent trend toward decreasing overall U.S. foreign aid obligations has resulted in severe cuts in the appropriations for Africa. To say that some African states are distressed at the recent change in U.S. aid policy would be an understatement. The smaller states especially feel that the continuation of U.S. assistance is necessary to sufficiently develop their economies so that they can effectively participate in regional development programs.

It is imperative that our future foreign assistance policy decisions take into account the vital need for U.S. capital investments to aid African development. In a May 17 speech before the African-American Chamber of Commerce, Donald B. Easum, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs voiced his support in favor of increasing U.S. aid to African nations. I commend this speech to my colleagues as a thoughtful and accurate assessment of where our future foreign aid priorities ought to lie:

AFRICAN-AMERICAN COMMERCE: POTENTIAL FOR MUTUAL BENEFIT

(Address by Donald B. Easum, Assistant Secretary for African Affairs)

Addressing the African-American Chamber of Commerce appears to be one of the rites of passage for Assistant Secretaries of the African Bureau. I welcome the opportunity to speak to you today about some of the thoughts and impressions I've been forming since I took office two months ago.

I am already convinced we need to seek new approaches to cooperation between producers and consumers and between the rich

and poor countries of the world. The energy crisis, the prospect of shortages of vital resources, and the widening gap between the developed and developing countries have dramatized this necessity.

High oil prices have led to fertilizer shortages, which in turn have had a direct effect on food production. The message of this equation is brutally clear. In a world where half the people do not have enough to eat, the other half can never be safe from the inevitable political and social turmoil that will result. Confronted as we all are by this dilemma, one must acknowledge the interdependence of all countries and the necessity for cooperation to prevent a collapse of the world economic order and to promote a more rational economic system.

This was of course the theme of Secretary Kissinger's speech last month to the special session of the U.N. General Assembly on raw materials. He emphasized this point, saying "We in this Assembly must come to grips with the fact of our interdependence. . . . We are all engaged in a common enterprise."

How does this concept of interdependence apply to our relationships with Africa?

In a world where resources are finite and competition for markets is keen, we will find ourselves becoming more dependent on Africa for raw materials and as a trading partner. A few statistics will demonstrate what I mean.

The United States already imports 98 percent of its manganese, of which 54 percent comes from Africa. We depend on Ghana for 6 percent of our imported aluminum, on South Africa for 24 percent of our chrome, on Zaïre, and Zambia for 47 percent of our cobalt, on Nigeria for 15 percent of our columbium and tantalum, on Malagasy for 22 percent of our graphite, on Liberia for 8 percent of the iron ore we import and 7 percent of our natural rubber. This dependency is bound to expand.

Africa has 96 percent of the world's diamonds, 42 percent of its cobalt, 60 percent of its gold, 34 percent of its bauxite, 17 percent of its copper, and 23 percent of the free world's uranium. All of the world's 53 most important minerals are found in Africa. It is a veritable storehouse of mineral wealth. Africa's iron reserves are twice those of the United States and two-thirds those of the U.S.S.R.

Africa's energy resources, still largely untapped, are among the greatest in the world. The African Continent is estimated to have 16 percent of the world's water power—more than any other continent. The petroleum reserves of the continent have yet to be assessed. Nigeria, however, has already become the seventh largest producer of crude oil in the world and ranks among the four leading foreign suppliers of U.S. oil.

As for African markets, the United States share has been minor; but it is growing. The United States is a relative newcomer politically and economically to the African scene. This has allowed us to escape some of the onus of colonialism, but it has placed us at a disadvantage in many African countries which have continued to maintain special trade relationships with their ex-colonial rulers. In 1971 African markets took only 3.6 percent of total U.S. exports and they supplied only 2.6 percent of our imports. There are strong competitors already well established. Germany's share of the African market rose from 6 percent in 1960 to 10 percent in 1972, and in the same period while the U.S. percentage remained at 9 percent, Japan double its share, from 3 percent to 6 percent.

Even so, two-way trade between Africa and the United States nearly tripled between 1960 and 1970, rising to \$4.3 billion in 1973. U.S. exports to Africa in 1973 were up 46 percent over 1972. In 1973, the United States sold 651 million dollars' worth of machinery to Africa; 425 million dollars' worth of transport equipment; and 578 million dollars' worth of agricultural commodities.

AFRICA'S NEED FOR CAPITAL AND DEVELOPMENT

Just as we are growing more dependent on African resources and markets, Africa is looking to the United States for the capital and the technology to develop its economies and improve the quality of life for its peoples.

There are still vast unused areas of arable land, pasture, and forest in Africa. With proper irrigation and modern agricultural techniques, every important crop in the world can be grown in some part of the continent. Research and testing can identify varieties of grain that will ripen with less rainfall. Fertile river valleys can be resettled when the black fly that transmits river blindness is eradicated. By the introduction of new animal breeds, development of new techniques of water distribution, and the control of animal diseases, African livestock farming can be made much more productive. African waters teem with fish that could provide another source of food. Important mineral resources remain to be developed.

But realization of all this potential is held back by such factors as lack of technology, a shortage of capital, insufficient internal markets, weak transportation and communications systems, and inadequate health services. In addition, many African countries are still heavily dependent for their foreign exchange earnings on such primary products as coffee, cocoa, peanuts, and copper. Market prices of these products are susceptible to wide fluctuations which make the countries especially vulnerable to world market developments over which they have little control.

Now, what are the implications in all this for U.S. business? U.S. business needs African raw materials and markets. Africa, on the other hand, needs U.S. capital and knowhow. It seems a fair exchange. But the potential investor may have to adjust his expectations. For example, the extractive field is becoming more difficult for private investors in some areas. With the growing opposition abroad to foreign ownership of natural resources, the threat of nationalization increases. We see clear evidence of this trend in the action program that the Group of 77 approved at the U.N. General Assembly. This presents a challenge to American entrepreneurs to develop alternative techniques for doing business such as franchising and management arrangements and joint ventures.

One used to say that a favorable climate for investment required political stability, access to markets, proximity to raw materials, low-cost labor, ability to repatriate earnings and capital, and of course a reasonable return on the investment. In order to do business today, however, the investor may have to forgo some of these conditions. Political stability, for example, has traditionally been a primary concern. But even in periods of unrest, companies which have had the foresight to adapt their requirements to the needs of the host country are often able to continue undisturbed by political change. The principle of mutual advantage is the best insurance any company has for guaranteeing a long-term economic relationship.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT PICTURE

The same degree of selectivity that goes into new plant construction at home, or new product development, is required in deciding whether to invest capital in an African country. Each African country has its distinct national identity, its own interests and problems, and its own investment climate.

A prime case in point is Nigeria, where the estimated American investment approaches \$1 billion, or approximately 50 percent of our investment in Black Africa. This investment is concentrated in the petroleum sector, but numerous U.S. firms are actively considering enterprises in agricultural production and processing and in industrial manufacturing and assembly operations, and we are encouraging this diversified investment.

Ground was broken in late April for a 500-room hotel in Lagos being constructed as a

joint venture of the Lagos State government, Occidental Petroleum, and Holiday Inns International.

Massive injections of foreign technology will be sought in the next few years as Nigeria taps vast reserves of natural gas and develops ancillary petrochemical and fertilizer industries. Nigeria's Federal Military Government seeks substantial negotiated equity participation in oil and gas and selected other key industries.

Since independence, Nigeria has consistently welcomed foreign investment in the private sector, although as of April 1, 22 small-scale service and distribution activities are reserved wholly for Nigerian citizens, and minority Nigerian participation is required in 33 medium-level business and manufacturing enterprises. These restrictions have been conceived and implemented fairly and responsibly.

The search by foreign firms for Nigerian buyers and partners has unearthed an unexpected reservoir of Nigerian capitalists with money to invest. The vitality of Nigeria's outward-looking private sector was further demonstrated by a major trade mission to the United States in late 1973, organized and financed by a score of Nigerian businessmen representing the Nigerian-American Chamber of Commerce in Lagos.

In the expectation that foreign exchange in 1974 will increase threefold or more due to rising oil revenues, Nigeria on April 1 lowered import and excise duties on many foodstuffs and raw materials and acted to place import payments and remittance of profits and dividends on a current basis. The new level of revenue and exchange earnings will reduce Nigeria's dependence on external financing, but it is anticipated that the technical and management expertise of foreign investors will be needed to implement the massive development program the new revenues make possible.

Executing the program will pose unique challenges, but for foreign businessmen interested in participating in Nigeria's dramatic economic growth both the official welcome and the business opportunities are clearly present.

Similar challenges and opportunities present themselves in Zaïre. One example may be sufficient to illustrate the kinds of arrangements that appear to us as highly beneficial to both sides. This is the recent signature of a \$250 million contract for the construction of a 1,200-mile powerline running across the country. Zaïre looked to the United States not only for financing but for the technological expertise which could carry out this pioneering construction venture. The powerline, in turn, will permit expansion of the copper industry in Shaba, an expansion in which we, as a copper-consuming nation, are keenly interested.

Some of the smaller, less well-known countries also provide interesting investment possibilities. In Dahomey, for example, at the prompting of U.S. Ambassador Robert Anderson, a study was made several months ago of the potential for American trade in a Francophone African market. In contrast to the generally held belief that these countries are a French preserve, the study found that Dahomean government and business leaders welcome the expansion of U.S. trade. Even local French importers, who operate the most important houses, do not resist U.S. imports. As one French businessman put it, "I am not here to sell French products; I am here to sell any product that is competitive."

Among the factors limiting American trade, according to the study, were a lack of aggressiveness on the part of U.S. exporters; failure to correspond or supply promotional material in French; delays in the arrival of U.S. goods due to irregular and infrequent shipping; foreign exchange and credit limitations; and a natural customer preference for familiar products.

Despite these barriers the report concluded

that the environment is favorable for expansion of American trade with Dahomey. Although the present market for most goods is small, when taken as a part of a greater west African market the potential becomes more attractive. Even without a change in preferential treatment accorded French and other European imports, many American products are competitive now. The United States exported over 5.8 million dollars' worth of goods to Dahomey in 1971, which imported over 93 million dollars' worth from other sources. The study showed that, of that total, the United States could have been competitive in a market worth at least \$35 million. Such careful attention to other African markets might identify similar opportunities for expansion of U.S. exports.

The investment picture in Dahomey is also encouraging. A new investment code guarantees foreign investors certain tax exemptions, equitable compensation in case of expropriation, nondiscriminatory treatment between foreign and domestic capital, and repatriation of profits. There are several American-financed projects in varying stages of realization including a hotel in Cotonou, a cement plant, a tomato paste factory, a vegetable oil factory, an oil refinery, and an oil-drilling operation. What has been found to be true in Dahomey with regard to investment may very well apply to other Francophone countries.

Botswana is another country which offers attractive investment opportunities. Foreign investment is actively sought by the government, which, in addition to investment incentives, provides generous allowances on capital investment. There is also a tax allowance of 125 percent of approved training costs, and the President may grant further tax allowances in specific cases. The Botswana Constitution specifically prohibits nationalization except by the express provision of legislation approved by the National Assembly and guarantees prompt payment of adequate compensation in these cases. All foreign investment proposals must be approved by the Botswana Government, but there are no restrictions on private foreign investment and no limitations on repatriation of profits.

American Metal Climax has a multimillion-dollar investment in a copper-nickel mine in Botswana, the Alaska International Airways has recently begun air freight operations in southern Africa with headquarters in Botswana. Another firm is exploring prospects for cattle ranching.

U.S. GOVERNMENT'S CONTRIBUTION

These are just a few examples. There are others. We in the government can serve as a catalyst for bringing people together on these and other opportunities. We can, and do, facilitate private investment and trade, the former through insurance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) and the latter through the extension of credit and guarantees by the Export-Import Bank and through trade promotion activities of the Department of Commerce and by our Embassies abroad.

I understand that OPIC's new President, Marshall Mays, spoke to you only a few weeks ago on some of these matters, so I will not dwell on OPIC's important role. As for the Export-Import Bank, many of you are much better acquainted than I yet am with its array of services. By the end of February of this year, Eximbank's total exposure in Africa had risen to \$1.7 billion. This figure represents 9.5 percent of Eximbank's worldwide commitment. Of this amount, \$1.4 billion, or 85 percent, is in long-term loans and financial guarantees.

What about the Department of State? We have upgraded the economic and commercial sections of our Embassies to give more assistance to U.S. businessmen. Potential investors are invited to discuss their plans and projects with the appropriate geographic desk at the Department of State. We can

provide anything from a general overview to specific data on upcoming contract possibilities. We can provide our assessment of all the factors likely to affect the potential investor or tradesman.

In the field, our Embassies gather up-to-date information on trade and investment prospects. They are instructed to transmit by telegram advance information on such opportunities. They can sometimes expedite decisions on matters of interest to American business firms. In Zaïre and the Sudan, for example, our Embassies have been instrumental in making arrangements for the sale of American locomotives. In Gabon, the Embassy has acted as an intermediary with the government in seeking contracts for American firms with the Trans-Gabon railway.

In spite of these institutions, guarantees, and services aimed at paving the way for American investment, doing business in the developing world requires special effort. There can be frustrations on both sides. However, if businessmen want to expand their markets, they must seek accommodation with their African hosts—especially with those who are increasingly asserting their right to define the pattern and style of foreign investment in terms of their national interests and priorities. At the same time, those who seek capital and trade must accept the fact that in order to attract and keep the foreign capital and technological know-how they need—a need made more pressing by soaring energy costs—they must create a climate of confidence. The investor has certain legitimate expectations. He should be able to count on the proposition, for example, that the original basis on which he agreed to accept the risks of investment will continue to apply.

Changed circumstances may of course require readjustments. We see this most frequently in the raw materials area, since uncertainty about future prices of some materials is great. When adjustments are in order, it is in the interests of both sides to discuss and work out together mutually satisfactory solutions. Arbitrary or unilateral changes destroy confidence and serve neither party in the long run.

Trade and investment and economic development are linked in a circle of cause and effect. There can be few trade and investment opportunities in a country where the per capita income is under \$100 or where drought is turning grazing land into desert.

Mindful of our responsibility to help the developing countries help themselves, the Department of State is urging support for a Senate resolution authorizing continued U.S. participation in the International Development Association. Proposed by the United States, IDA, the soft-loan window of the World Bank, was set up in 1960 to mobilize capital for the development of the poorest nations and to help protect them against a heavy debt-service burden. The member nations of IDA have called for a U.S. contribution of \$1.5 billion over a four-year period to the fourth IDA replenishment, or one-third of the total. Our participation has declined from an initial 42.6 percent to the current level of 33 percent as the contributions of other nations have increased. The House of Representatives voted earlier this year to deny the IDA funds, an action which may threaten the continued existence of this much needed international activity. Hopefully, Senate action will be more positive.

Our efforts in support of the IDA replenishment are one reflection of our continuing concern in helping to create in Africa a more prosperous climate where both African and American interests can flourish. The role of U.S. private initiative in this endeavor is critical.

In a recent speech to the Organization of American States, Secretary Kissinger said, "... our nations face together a broad

agenda of interdependence. Instantaneous communications, global economics, and weapons of vast destructiveness have thrust mankind into a proximity which transforms world community from a slogan into a necessity. Our problems are unprecedented, in type and scale. But our purpose is age-old: to realize man's eternal aspiration for a life of peace, well-being, dignity, and justice."

UNITED STATES AND BANGLADESH SIGN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

The United States and Bangladesh have signed a bilateral agreement covering future U.S. economic, technical and related assistance to that nation, the Agency for International Development announced on May 22.

The agreement, which represents a cornerstone in the continuing cooperation between the two nations, was signed in Dacca by U.S. Ambassador Davis Eugene Boster and the Secretary of the Bangladesh Ministry of Planning, M. Syeduzzaman.

Such bilateral assistance agreements are maintained between the United States and other nations which receive U.S. economic and technical assistance. They establish the formal terms of U.S. assistance and the host country's expected contributions supporting joint development efforts.

The signing represents a turning point in the assistance relationship between the two nations, as Bangladesh continues to move from the relief and rehabilitation phase to long-term economic development.

The agreement comes two years after the United States signed its first relief and rehabilitation grant with Bangladesh. Such U.S. grants, along with food aid and grants to the United Nations relief operation and through voluntary agencies, totaled more than \$433 million. The rehabilitation program helped Bangladesh rebuild its war-torn economy, concentrating on the reconstruction of the agricultural, educational, and health sectors as well as transportation and communication.

FREEDOM TREE DEDICATION FOR CAPT. JONATHAN BEDNAREK, USAF

HON. ANGELO D. RONCALLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. RONCALLO of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1974, I had the privilege of attending the presentation of a memorial tree in honor of Jonathan Bednarek, MIA. I wish to share my remarks with my colleagues:

REMARKS

Theodore Roosevelt some 40 years ago said, "Where such results flow from battles as flowed from Bannockburn and Yorktown, centuries must pass before the wound not only scars over but becomes completely forgotten, and the memory becomes a band of Union and not a cause of division. It is our business to shorten the time as much as possible."

Now that the war in Vietnam is over it is my hope that our people shall become unified in reaffirming and rededicating themselves to the cause of peace, that while our memories of our own recent division shall quickly pass, our memory of the sacrifices made by Captain Bednarek and others will continue to serve as a reminder of the horror and high sacrifice of war and that we shall not completely rest until all our missing in action are fully accounted for.

THE HAWAII AND U.S. PACIFIC ISLANDS COMMERCE ACT OF 1974: NEITHER ANTILABOR NOR ANTI-MANAGEMENT

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 7189, the Hawaii and U.S. Pacific Islands Commerce Act of 1974, I hope that both the House and the Senate will have an opportunity to consider this much-needed legislation in the near future.

H.R. 7189 and its companion Senate bill, S. 1566, are designed to protect the people of Hawaii from disastrous interruptions in ocean commerce between the west coast and the Islands, such as those which occurred in 1971-72. During an 18-month period beginning in the summer of 1971, ocean commerce between the west coast and Hawaii was cut off for about 6 months—approximately 1 day out of every 3. The economic impact is still being felt by the people of the Nation's only island State—innocent observers and not parties in the dock disputes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7189 and S. 1566 are not antilabor bills. Indeed, they would help protect the workingman in Hawaii who suffered grievously during the previous dock tie-ups. In drafting this legislation, the Hawaii congressional delegation, all of whom are cosponsors of the measure, exercised great care to protect the right to strike and the collective bargaining rights of both labor and management. A summary of the bill's provisions, and strong arguments for its early passage by Congress, were succinctly presented by the Honolulu Star-Bulletin in an editorial published on June 17, 1974. I am submitting the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD and I urge my colleagues to take the time to read it and become familiar with Hawaii's appeal for equity in this matter.

The editorial follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, June 17, 1974]

THE SHIPPING ACT

To the American labor movement, nothing is more sacred than the right to strike—and for good reason.

The strike is labor's heavy artillery, its cutting edge.

Without it, the American working man would not enjoy the high wages and working conditions that prevail today.

Without it, Hawaii would be a quite different—and less democratic—place than it is today. Titanic labor struggles in Hawaii after World War II destroyed a semi-feudal economic structure, won labor a place as an equal of management, and paved the way for genuine political and racial democracy in these islands.

Hawaii today is one of the most unionized communities in America, one of the more liberal states politically, and a place where no politician gets far by making an enemy of organized labor.

This makes it particularly significant that all four members of Hawaii's congressional

delegation, three Democrats and a Republican, are united in supporting a bill that will go to the floor of the U.S. Senate next week to limit the right to strike.

Sens. Hiram L. Fong (R) and Daniel K. Inouye (D) are cosponsors of S. 1566, entitled "The Hawaii and U.S. Pacific Island Commerce Act of 1974". Reps. Spark M. Matsunaga (D) and Patsy T. Mink (D) are supporting similar legislation in the House.

They are not enemies of labor, and they would not do anything to hurt the labor movement, yet they find common cause in promoting a bill that Labor Secretary Peter Brennan went out of his way to oppose earlier this month.

What S. 1566 would do is give Hawaii, Samoa, Guam and Micronesia, which are all the U.S.-controlled islands of the Pacific, a 160-day "cushion" whenever there is a West Coast maritime strike or lockout.

It would provide for shipping service to continue uninterrupted to these islands for 160 days after a West Coast maritime strike or lockout begins, and for workers retroactively to get the benefits of any settlements once terms are agreed on.

S. 1566 is needed because of the overwhelming dependence of the Pacific islands on surface shipping to maintain their economies—and the frequency of interruptions in the past, an average of nearly two shut-downs a year since World War II.

To cut off shipping to Hawaii is as damaging as cutting off trucking and railroad service to New York City or Washington, D.C. The economy slowly strangles.

Yet while truck and rail strikes in the East usually bring rapid federal intervention, the 1971 maritime strike dragged on for 100 days before President Nixon declared an emergency and invoked a Taft-Hartley cooling off period. By that time Hawaii had suffered shortages, higher prices, job layoffs, shortened work hours, a virtual shutdown of its construction industry, and an inability to get its sugar and pineapple to Mainland markets. A year later the economic effects were still being felt.

To settle their labor disagreements, some 18,000 labor and management people brought severe economic hardship to nearly 1,000,000 innocent bystanders, including union members, in the Pacific islands.

To the nation as a whole a West Coast maritime strike is not an emergency. To us it is. Yet the Hawaii trade constitutes somewhat less than 3 per cent of the dockside labor at West Coast ports. Adding in the other Pacific islands brings it to 3½ per cent. Of shipboard labor, some 7 per cent is involved.

The carriers operating in the Hawaii trade constitute less than 13 per cent of the voting power in the Pacific Maritime Association, the bargaining agent for management.

These statistics show why Hawaii's members of Congress, despite their strong ties to labor, can conscientiously support S. 1566.

By giving a "cushion" to the Pacific islands, S. 1566 does not substantially diminish the capability of labor and management to apply pressure on each other.

In fact, the reverse may be true since the existence of S. 1566 would make federal intervention under the Taft-Hartley Act less likely to occur in a future West Coast maritime strike.

We are particularly pained at the Nixon Administration's position on S. 1566. Until the summer of 1972, Mr. Nixon was actively supporting strong general legislation to allow the government to impose settlements if necessary in transportation disputes nationwide.

After a meeting with Teamster leaders in which they threw their support to Mr. Nixon for re-election, Mr. Nixon withdrew support for the transportation strike bill. His assistant John Ehrlichman personally told the Honolulu Star-Bulletin that if the Teamsters cared to believe there was a connection be-

tween these actions, the administration would not deny it.

Mr. Nixon promised at the same time to create a Commission on Industrial Peace that would develop alternate legislative proposals, but this commission was late in being appointed and has not been significant.

Labor Secretary Brennan's position on S. 1566 seems an extension of the 1972 "deal" which is a very raw one so far as Hawaii is concerned.

S. 1566 will not significantly impair the right to strike. It will be tremendously important, however, to the economic stability of the U.S. Pacific Islands. It faces a tough floor fight. It deserves to pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF CONCERNS

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to share with my colleagues the recent remarks of Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett to the stockholders of Grey Advertising, Inc. Dr. Goodlett is an old and dear friend. He is the publisher of the San Francisco Sun Reporter and president of the National Newspaper Publishers Association.

I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

GENERAL STATEMENT OF CONCERNS

(By Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett)

The United States of America continues to be a polarized country composed of two nations, one white and one black, both separate and becoming daily more unequal. The black nation-USA, with a population of 25 million persons, is larger than 152 other nations in the world; and to bring the comparison closer to home, of the 36 nations comprising North and South America, only three: the white nation-USA with 184 million, Brazil with 91 million and Mexico with 45 million, are larger than the black nation-USA. The estimated gross product of the black nation-USA is 4.5 percent of the Nation's total \$1.15 trillion. In many metropolitan areas served by our company, blacks comprise from 30 to 40 percent of the population and, upon a cursory survey, an even greater percentage of our sales.

Despite the fact that blacks number approximately 25,000,000 persons in America, the policy of the advertising industry has not been one of even lip-service support of both Federal and State fair employment practices statutes. We believe that Grey Advertising, Inc. is no better or worse than our sister advertising agencies, and that we fall far short of the fair employment and equal opportunity mandate which requires that women and racial minorities be distributed from the board of directors' chambers to the janitors' closets. The insensitivity of corporate enterprise to its responsibility to obey fair employment laws is amazing and in many instances distressing. We readily condemn the felon who violates the law; however, is a corporation which violates fair employment statutes less guilty, and is not the violence which the corporation inflicts upon the hopes and aspirations of non-whites as grave to society as the deeds of the felon who robs and steals?

FAIR EMPLOYMENT

While our company employs a number of racial minorities in menial, low-level capacities, we are demanding full equity in the

employment of women and racial minorities, with no differentials in salary or opportunities for upgrading because of covert forms of discrimination.

It is regrettable that Grey Advertising is guilty of the same criticism leveled against America's 50 largest corporations with an excess of 2,500 top executive positions, none of which are filled by a single black person.

The law that there shall be no discrimination in employment based upon race, color, creed, sex or age demands that racial minorities, especially blacks, Chicanos and Oriental Americans, and women, be integrated in all job categories of Grey Advertising, throughout the infra-structure of our company.

FAIR ADVERTISING

It is estimated that the gross billings of the U.S. advertising industry is approximately \$20 billion per year. The policy of the advertising industry has not been one of reciprocal response to the needs of the black community, by urging and guiding the majority of its clients toward an equitable expenditure of the U.S. advertising dollars in the black press. U.S. business must be urged by the advertising industry and especially by our company to allocate a fair share of sustained advertising for the black community newspaper. Such constructive efforts in combating institutional racism will reflect our awareness of U.S. business's responsibilities to the black community, which contributes from 20 to 30 percent toward the gross income of certain businesses such as foods, clothing, automobiles, alcoholic spirits, entertainment et al. The black community cannot develop a viable press when advertising corporations such as Grey Advertising remain insensitive to their role in ending the practice of discrimination in advertising and fail to acquaint each client with the black community's demands to receive a proportionate share of all consumer advertising budgets. It is the right of every black consumer to demand that promotional and advertising monies derived from black pocketbooks be returned to the black community, so that the black nation may maintain a black-owned communications medium which reflects its \$45 billion purchasing power.

No community, white or black, can develop without a strong community newspaper. We predict that the returns in patronage and community good-will will increase for Grey's clients commensurate with their increased support by their advertising dollars of minority-owned community newspapers.

In 1973 Grey Advertising had a gross billing of \$352,000,000 of which 10 percent was spent in newspapers—over \$35 million; yet, only \$122,233.52 net was spent in the black press.

The failure of advertising agencies to spend advertising dollars equitably in black newspapers is glaringly illustrated in the State of California—a State whose black population is 1,547,000; there are 17 sister States in the Nation with smaller populations. Our clients would not dare to deny to the States smaller than the population of black California a bigger share of their local advertising budgets. We venture to say that the purchasing power of California's blacks certainly exceeds that of the majority of States with smaller populations. However, the black newspapers of the black population of California are victims of Grey Advertising's covert institutional racism in the area of advertising. We feel certain that Grey's clients are also guilty of institutional racism, and the failure of our company to vigorously combat this racial blight is an insidious crime against the black consumer whose purchasing power easily determines whether Grey Advertising's clients show a yearly profit or a loss.

THREE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE FORM OF MOTIONS

To rectify these wrongs, three recommendations are made in the form of motions:

1. That management be instructed to issue, within the next six months, a full report to our stockholders of its distribution of employees, based upon race and sex, delineating policies of promotion in the main job categories.

2. That stockholders be given a report on the recommendations of Grey Advertising to our clients on the expenditure of their advertising dollars in both the white and the black press.

3. That a stockholders' fair employment and fair advertising committee be appointed to assist management in broadening its programs of fair employment and equitable upgrading, which would allow our company to become an outstanding example of how the advertising industry might assume a proper role of corporate responsibility in ameliorating the racial crisis and the crisis of sex discrimination, which threaten our national progress in the decade of the '70's.

THE NEED TO INCREASE THE CORPORATE SURTAX EXEMPTION LEVEL

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to increase the corporate surtax exemption to \$50,000 effective as of January 1, 1975, and to \$100,000 over a 5-year period.

There are over 1.6 million active corporations in the United States today. More than 80 percent of these firms are small businesses which have annual gross receipts of under \$500,000. Approximately 99 percent employ fewer than 250 persons and have assets of less than \$2,000,000.

Small business in the 1970's continues to represent economic opportunity, with its risks and its challenges, for the young, the innovative, the minorities, and the adventurous. A healthy small business sector is an essential ingredient in our economic system, and it should continually be encouraged to expand.

New businesses of necessity, usually start small. Often their greatest need is to conserve and expand working capital in order to improve day-to-day operations, to strengthen profit margins, and, in some cases, even to survive. It is generally agreed that the accelerating inflation of the past 7 years had had a particularly damaging effect on small businesses, both limiting their often costly access to capital markets and external financing and diminishing the value of existing small business tax relief provisions.

Taxation, of course, is a major factor affecting the ability of a small firm to meet its capital requirements. As the President's Task Force on Improving the Prospects of Small Business reported:

The inhibiting effect of high income tax rates on small business has long been recognized. New and growing small businesses often cannot meet their initial and early costs and, at the same time, pay out a high proportion of earnings in income taxes. A high income tax depletes the internal funds for additional investment on which the small

business must mainly rely. Measures that permit increased retention of earnings, on the other hand, help to finance growth, ease the climate of borrowing, and foster the establishment and healthy expansion of small concerns.

The simplest and most appropriate form of tax relief for small businesses would be an increase in the \$25,000 corporate surtax exemption. This mechanism exempts from the surtax the first \$25,000 of a corporation's taxable income. The Internal Revenue Code currently imposes a normal tax of 22 percent on all of a corporation's taxable income plus a surtax of 26 percent on taxable income in excess of the \$25,000 surtax exemption. It was anticipated that the majority of small businesses would be subject only to the 22-percent normal tax because such companies generally would not recognize taxable incomes substantially more than \$25,000.

However, the value of this exemption has been greatly diminished since its inception in 1950, by inflation's savage attack. In the interim personal exemptions and the standard deduction have been liberalized significantly and the low-income allowance has been introduced, but no comparable relief has been offered for small business.

Formerly, a controlled group of corporations could use multiple surtax exemptions to offset some of the loss of value from inflation. However, this practice led to charges of abuse, and the Tax Reform Act of 1969 required the phaseout of such multiple exemptions. After 1974, no controlled group will be allowed more than one \$25,000 exemption. This phaseout improves the climate for an increase in the surtax exemption itself.

Such an increase:

First, would not require any exhaustive study by congressional staffs, complicated technical drafting, or time-consuming administrative implementation;

Second, would not require new regulations or rulings for its interpretation;

Third, would not become as controversial or as litigation prone as a new form of credit or a new deduction or an overhaul of the corporate tax provisions;

Fourth, would provide simple, efficient, and equitable tax relief to small businesses.

This bill would increase the surtax exemption to \$50,000 for taxable years starting after December 31, 1974, and scale it up to \$100,000 over a 5-year period. This would have a very minimal effect on the fiscal 1975 budget and only an approximate \$1 billion impact during its first full year of implementation, with no allowance for the "feedback" effect from higher employment and better utilization of resources in the small business sector.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 15750

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the corporate surtax exemption

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 11(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to surtax exemption) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Surtax Exemption.—For purposes of this subtitle, the surtax exemption shall be equal to the following amount:

"(1) \$50,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1975.

"(2) \$60,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1976.

"(3) \$70,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1977.

"(4) \$80,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1978.

"(5) \$90,000, in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1979.

"(6) \$100,000 in the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1979."

(b) (1) Paragraph (7) of section 12 of such Code (relating to cross references) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) For disallowance of surtax exemption in the case of certain multiple corporations, see section 1551."

(2) Such section 12 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(9) For limitation on surtax exemption in the case of certain controlled corporations, see section 1561."

(c) Section 962(c) of such Code (relating to surtax exemption) is amended—

(1) by striking out "provided by section 11(c)", and

(2) by striking out "\$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "the amount of the surtax exemption (as defined in section 11(d)) without regard to this subsection)".

(d) (1) Paragraph (1) of section 1561(a) of such Code (relating to limitations on certain multiple tax benefits in the case of certain controlled corporations) (as amended by section 401(a)(1) of the Tax Reform Act of 1969) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) one surtax exemption (as defined in section 11(d))."

(2) Such section 1561(a) is amended by striking out "The amount specified in paragraph (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "The amount of the surtax exemption specified in paragraph (1)".

Sec. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1974.

PHILADELPHIA FIRE DEPARTMENT HONORED FOR FINE WORK

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Fire Department has been honored by the U.S. Coast Guard for its fine work in extinguishing a fire involving the 31,000-ton Greek oil tanker *Elias* at the Atlantic Richfield Co.'s Port Mifflin Marine Terminal, in Tinicum Township, Delaware County, on April 9 of this year.

Rear Adm. Austin C. Wagner, commandant of the 7th Coast Guard District, Miami, Fla., presented an award citing the fire department's work to Fire Commissioner Joseph R. Rizzo, on Monday, July 1, at fire headquarters in Philadelphia.

Commissioner Rizzo directed the 40 fire units, including 3 fireboats and 165 men who responded from Philadelphia along with personnel from other area fire departments and marine units of the U.S. Coast Guard and the U.S. Navy in fighting the four-alarm blaze and subsequent explosions which took the lives of 13 people.

LARRY MULAY RETIRES

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues the retirement of Larry Mulay, who served as general manager and managing editor of the city news bureau, after 55 years in the business, the longest record of service of any newspaperman in my city of Chicago.

I have known Larry Mulay personally for a period of 30 years, and he has always been a sincere, dedicated, modest, and unassuming, but highly effective and capable newspaperman. His dedication to news reporting in Chicago is legendary throughout the industry.

I want to congratulate him upon his retirement and to wish him continuing good health during the years ahead.

An article about Larry Mulay's career in journalism, that appeared in *Fra Noi*, Chicagoland's Italian-American newspaper which serves 250,000 people, follows:

PLAUDITS TO CNB'S MULAY

To say Larry Mulay's career started as an accident would be quite an understatement. He was delivering a message in an office building in 1919 when he walked through the wrong door—that of the City News Bureau.

The late CNB boss Walter Brown shouted: "Don't just stand there; get to work!"

Last month newspaper and civic officials of Chicago and across the nation honored Larry Mulay who was retiring—as general manager and managing editor of City News Bureau—after 55 years in the business, the longest record of service of any newsman in Chicago.

When he was 8 years old, orphan Larry Mulay was hawking newspapers in front of the Moody Bible Institute. When he was 12, he had his own newsstand at Division & Clybourn. When he was 15, he was a copy boy for CNB. At 17 he was a full-fledged reporter covering his first hanging.

At that point Mulay decided that the news game was what he wanted to play.

Mulay advanced rapidly from copyboy to reporter and rewriter. He became city editor in 1930, assistant general manager in 1939 and head man in 1964.

Mulay reminisced about his career after one of several dinners honoring him last month, recalling some of the stories he covered and some of the now-famous journalists he instructed in the basics of the business.

"I think you could say that the last of the Roaring Twenties reporters is finally leaving the ranks," said Mulay. "I took part in many of the famous stories of the 20s through now."

"At one time, I covered 110 consecutive murders in as many days. That was during the turbulence of the Prohibition gang wars here."

"I had many opportunities to go to the newspapers and into other fields," Mulay said.

"But I was happy in the training end of our profession. We at City News Bureau got our satisfaction from the prominence and the high positions our students attained."

Many of Mulay's former students are members of the four metropolitan daily newspapers of Chicago. To name just a few of the prominent figures:

Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist Mike Royko of the Chicago Daily News; Seymour Hersh, who won a Pulitzer Prize for breaking the story of the My Lai Massacre; Clayton

Kirkpatrick, editor of the Chicago Tribune; Robert Schultz, city editor for the Chicago Daily News; novelist Kurt Vonnegut Jr.; playwright Charles MacArthur, and Jean Kennedy Smith, the late President Kennedy's sister.

"Altogether" said Mulay, "I was gratified that I trained more than '6,000 aspiring journalists." Last year alone, nine City News Bureau graduates won Pulitzer Prizes.

CEA CHAIRMAN CONFIRMS THAT ECONOMIC RECOVERY WILL BE SLOW

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday's New York Times carried an article in which the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers revealed that the "recovery" of the economy during the second half of this year will be slower than previously forecasted. This admission clearly indicates the inability of the Nixon economic strategy to effectively come to grips with the soaring inflation, the rampant level of unemployment and the various other severe economic dislocations being experienced in the Nation.

However, Dr. Stein's comments were even more revealing when he reportedly stated that the reason for this change in forecast was "the sluggishness in housing." Inasmuch as the President himself froze housing funds for about a year and a half there can be little question that this ill-conceived action is directly responsible for the slow recovery and that it has seriously exacerbated the conditions which have restricted real economic growth. We are thus able to clearly see the manner in which this administration's ineffective priorities have so seriously eroded the Nation's economic foundations.

I submit herewith, for inclusion in the Record, the New York Times article:

[From the New York Times, July 28, 1974]

STEIN NOW EXPECTS A SLOWER RECOVERY

WASHINGTON, June 27.—The Government now expects the recovery in the economy in the second half of this year to be "a little less" than had previously been forecast, the President's Council of Economic Advisers disclosed today.

The reason cited for this change in the forecast is "the sluggishness in housing." Many private forecasters have come to the same conclusion.

Herbert Stein, chairman of the council, said he was "not concerned" if the growth of output fell "a little below" the earlier projected path. But he emphasized that the Government was not taking the view that "the more sluggish, the better, or the higher unemployment, the better."

The council's regular monthly statement on the economy, based on the latest statistics, said, "Economic developments during the past month strengthened the belief that the decline of the economy had come to an end."

As for inflation, the statement said: "The big price increases in May, while they would not prevent a significant decline of inflation

by yearend, deferred progress toward that goal."

Gary L. Seever, a member of the council, said the recent upward movement of grain prices on the commodity markets—following a steep fall that began in March—reflect bad weather and had "put us a little behind the game" in the hope for lower food prices. But, he said, it has not changed the "basic outlook" for food prices, which is for little further increase during the rest of this year.

Mr. Stein repeated the Government assessment that the second quarter gross national product would show an "insignificant difference" from that of the first quarter in real terms, with current evidence suggesting "a little plus."

EAGLE SCOUTS HONORED

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 2, 1974

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress outstanding examples of young citizens who exemplify the highest standards of Americanism.

In this particular instance, it is two young men from Baldwin Borough in the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania who have achieved the coveted rank of Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America.

Frank Amuso and Daniel W. Baxter, members of Troop 376, sponsored by St. Wendelin's Church, were awarded their Eagle ratings at a court of honor ceremony conducted earlier this month. The Scouting careers of these two outstanding youths are quite similar. Both began as Cub Scouts, joining the Boy Scouts in 1969 and the Explorer Scouts in 1972. After rising through the various ranks of Scouting, the two concentrated on the Eagle, which requires the earning of at least 24 merit badges, participation in numerous service projects, and proof they possess the quality of leadership, so essential in scouting.

Young Amuso and Baxter proved themselves worthy of the honor. Frank, a student at South Catholic High School, now serves as a junior assistant scoutmaster for Troop 376; Dan, who attends Carrick High School, is an assistant senior patrol leader and has been named to the President's All-American team.

In addition to Amuso and Baxter, Troop 376 has produced two other Eagle Scouts in the past 7 years. The first was Joseph T. Schimborski, a son of Mr. Joseph B. Schimborski, who serves as committee chairman for Troop 376. Young Schimborski won his Eagle rating in 1965. The other was John Zorn, Jr., now a third-year college student, who received his rank in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues in the Congress of the United States join me in extending congratulations to Frank Amuso and Daniel Baxter. The honors accorded them bring credit to themselves, their families, and their Scout leaders, Mr. Ray Kampmeyer, Troop 376 Scoutmaster, and Mr. Schimborski.